SECRETARY'S COPY

SAN FRANCISCO

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, July 11, 1968.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, July 11, 1968, at 1:00 P.M. in the meeting room at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Mrs. Charles B. Porter, Vice President; Virgil L. Elliott, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Jr., James S. Kearney, and Walter W. Wight, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: William M. Brinton, President; Walter S. Newman.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation; Robert W. Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator; Wayne Rieke, Planner IV-Zoning; Samuel Jung, Planner IV; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner; Maitland Zane represented the San Francisco Chronicle; Lorraine Petty represented the San Francisco Daily Commercial News.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Elliott, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meetings of June 13, 20, and 27, 1968, be approved as submitted.

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, reported that Mayor Alioto had requested the Department of City Planning to review proposals which have been made for use of Alcatraz Island and to prepare a plan for its acquisition from the Federal Government.

The Director reminded the Commission that the Board of Supervisors will hold a public hearing next Monday to consider the request for vacation of portions of Montgomery and Lombard Streets for the International Market Center.

The Director advised the Commission that the firm of Urban Design Associates has completed urban design studies for each of the two BART subway station entrance areas on Mission Street. A summary report is now being prepared which will be presented to the Commission in early August.

The Director informed the Commission of the cost involved in producing two reports recently published by the Department of City Planning -- the 1969 Housing Inventory Report ($3,470) and the Population Projections Report ($4,600).

Committee.

President Brinton stated that he had received a letter from Robert J. Dolan, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, suggesting that the Commission undertake a new investigation to determine whether the conditions which it had proposed in granting conditional use authorization for operation of a quarry at Tocoloma and Lathrop Avenues are being complied with in fact.

President Brinton stated that he had received a letter from Henrik Bull, President of the Northern California Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, requesting that the City Planning Commission take some positive action in support of the U. S. Housing and Urban Development In-City Program. Subsequently, the Secretary read a draft resolution which had been prepared to call the HUD In-City Program to the attention of Mayor Alioto and the Board of Supervisors and requesting them to confer with the Department of Housing and Urban Development and with its agent, Kaiser Engineers, to determine whether an experimental program would be feasible and appropriate for San Francisco. After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Wight, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6269.

President Brinton abstained from voting.

REFERRALS

R64.50 Vacation of a portion of Bowdoin Street north of Gaven Street. (Under advisement from meetings of December 17, 1964 and September 19, 1968)

R118.68.3 Tentative subdivision map, Block 5846. (Under advisement from meeting of September 19, 1968)

R68.47 Vacation of portions of Gaven Street and exchange of property. (Under advisement from meeting of September 19, 1968)

R118.68.4 Resubdivision of portions of Block 5846 and 5861.

Samuel Jung, Planner IV, noted that the subject referrals had been taken under advisement from the meeting of September 19, 1968, to allow for further discussion between the staff of the Department of City Planning and the applicant concerning certain aspects of the proposed development. One of the primary issues which had been unresolved related to the feasibility of constructing a stairway from the proposed subdivision to the deadend of West View Avenue as recommended by the staff. The applicant's architect had submitted a sketch of a "free standing" stairway; and the Department of Public Works had indicated that it would probably be possible to construct a stairway conforming more closely to the contour of the hill. The Department of Public Works had estimated that a stairway could be constructed at a cost of $4,500 to $6,000;

however, in view of information which had been made available as the result of a more recent survey of the hill, the cost of such a stairway would probably exceed that estimated amount. Nevertheless, the staff of the Department of City Planning felt that the stairway should be constructed. Without the stairway, school children would be required to walk almost 2/3 of a mile from the subdivision to the nearest school; and much of that walk would be along Alemany Boulevard, a heavily traveled thoroughfare. If the stairway were constructed, however, the walking distance to the school would be reduced by almost 50 per cent.

Harold Dow, architect for the applicant, felt that the $6,000 estimate of cost for the stairway was unrealistic; however, he believed that his clients would be willing to provide the money if anyone else were able to construct the stairway at that price. His own estimate was that the stairway would cost approximately $15,000. In any case, if the stairway were to be constructed, it would involve a climb of approximately five stories; and he felt that mothers walking their children to school would prefer to go by way of Alemany Boulevard rather than to use the stairway. Therefore, since the stairway would be expensive and since he doubted that it would be used, he aksed that it not be required.

Mr. Jung stated that the Department of Public Works had suggested that it might be possible to use the width of the easement to absorb some of the horizontal distance of the stairway so that it would conform better to the slope than the stairway which had been depicted in the sketch submitted by Mr. Dow.

Commissioner Porter remarked that the stairway could be very dangerous unless it were to be enclosed up to the level of the railings. Mr. Jung stated that that would be the case if a freestanding stairway were to be constructed. If the stairway were to follow the contour of the slope, however, no danger would be involved.

The Director agreed with Mr. Dow that the stairway might be somewhat difficult to climb; nevertheless, he felt that the stairway would be used by children returning home from school. In any case, the recommendation of the City Planning Commission would be advisory in nature; and the Director of Public Works would make the final decision on the stairway as well as on other aspects of the proposed subdivision. Under the circumstances, he felt that the Commission, acting in its advisory capacity, should recommend that the stairway be constructed.

Carl Brown, representing the Associated Home Builders, remarked that very few single family homes are being constructed in San Francisco; and, of the single family homes which are being built, many are being provided in multi-family structures. Under the circumstances, he felt that the type of housing being proposed by the present applicant would be desirable for San Francisco Furthermore, since the proposed stairway would increase the cost of each of

the proposed houses by $500 to $700, he felt that it should not be required.

Commissioner Porter asked if it would be possible to recommend that money for the stairway be put in escrow by the applicants so that the stairway could be built at a later date if it were desired by people buying homes in the subdivision. Mr. Jung replied that it would be possible to put money in escrow for that purpose; however, if the cost of the stairway were to exceed the amount of money placed in escrow, an assessment district would have to be established to provide the additional funds which would be needed.

Commissioner Porter asked if a requirement for construction of this stairway would render the rest of the project impossible. Mr. Dow replied that it would merely make the project more difficult.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Kearney, seconded by Commissioner Elliott, and carried unanimously that the following reports be submitted to the Director of Public Works:

"R64.50 - The vacation of Bowdoin Street north of Gaven Street, as shown on SUR-1364, is in conformity with the Master Plan.

R68.47 - The vacation of portions of Gaven Street and exchange of property to permit the realignment of Gaven Street is in conformity with the Master Plan only if Gaven Street is not cut through to Alemany Way but is made into a cul-de-sac with an adequate turnaround and with screening to prevent Alemany Way traffic from attempting to reach it, and with a pedestrian connection to Alemany Way.

R118.68.4 - The proposed resubdivision of portions of Blocks 5846 and 5861, as shown on Drawing No. P2 of the resubdivision map entitled "Tentative Parcel Map for B.R.B. Homes" dated September 25, 1968, is approved. Vehicular access to Lot 14 should be from the cul-de-sac only as shown on said drawing.

R118.68.3 - The tentative subdivision map of Block 5846 should not be approved unless additional pedestrian access is provided to the dead end of West View Avenue. The pedestrian way should be installed at the expense of the developer prior to the time that houses in the subdivision are placed on sale. Lot 19 with access directly on Alemany Way should be eliminated.

Undergrounding of utilities should be provided in both the resubdivision and the subdivision."

R68.56 Vacation of Van Dyke Avenue between Hawes and Griffith Streets.

The Director stated that he had received a letter from the Cahill Construction Company, owner of the block bounded by Griffith Street, Van Dyke Avenue, Pitts Street and Wallace Avenue requesting that consideration of the subject referral be postponed.

Al Hicks, representing the Hunters Point-Bay View Joint Housing Committee, stated that the applicants had agreed to provide jobs and job training for residents of the subject neighborhood; and, under the circumstances, he felt that the Commission should proceed to consider the subject application as scheduled.

President Brinton noted that the Commission was due in City Hall for consideration of its 3:00 P.M. agenda; and he indicated that the subject referral would be considered by the Commission in Room 282 following a brief recess.

At 3:05 P.M. President Brinton announced the meeting was recessed. Members of the Commission then proceeded to Room 282, City Hall, and reconvened at 3:15 P.M.

3:15 P.M. - Room 282, City Hall

R68.56 (Continued)

Phoebe H. Brown, Planner IV, reported on this matter as follows:

"Consolidated Freightways has petitioned for the vacation of Van Dyke Avenue between Hawes and Griffith Streets in the South Bayshore area. It has a purchase agreement for the two blocks directly north and south of Van Dyke Avenue and wishes to combine and develop them as a truck freight terminal. The fee title to Van Dyke Avenue is held by the State, and if it is vacated the Port Authority will lease the street area to Consolidated Freightways. The two blocks are vacant now and Van Dyke Avenue is not improved, although it contains a sewer.

The South Bayshore studies recommend the use of Van Dyke Avenue, connecting with Williams Avenue west of Third Street, as a cross-district thoroughfare connecting the South Basin industrial area, in which there are some ten vacant blocks, with Bayshore Boulevard.

Consolidated Freightways has offered to give the City an easement across the northwestern corner of Block 4813 so that a diagonal street could be constructed connecting

Van Dyke Avenue with Underwood Avenue, along which the route would extend eastward. The diagonal street would have the same width as Van Dyke Avenue, 80 feet. The Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation has approved this proposal. The curve of the diagonal should have a 200-foot radius.

The street vacation will work to the disadvantage of the owners on Van Dyke Avenue east of Griffith Street, who will have to detour a block to get to Third Street.

Blocks 4813 and 4826 which Consolidated Freightways intends to acquire are in the M-1 zoning district. A truck terminal facility is a conditional use in M-1 (City Planning Code Sec. 211.2c) and the City Planning Commission in authorizing the use may require that certain conditions be met, such as landscaping."

James R. Hogan, representing the applicants, stated that his firm wished to build a truck freight terminal to provide jobs for residents of the Hunters Point neighborhood; and he remarked that the subject site had proven to be the only one available at a reasonable price. His firm also intended to build facilities for job training. However, it would be important for the proposed operation that the two blocks to be utilized should be joined together. He stated that it would be possible to build the proposed facility so that the sewer easement would not be covered; and he indicated that his firm would be willing to grant the city an easement so that Van Dyke Avenue could be constructed to connect with Underwood Avenue along a 200 foot radius curve. However, since he understood that Van Dyke Avenue would not be improved for at least five years, he wondered if it would be possible for his firm to obtain a revocable permit for use of the 200 foot radius curve until such time as the paving is to be installed.

The Director replied in the affirmative indicating, however, that it was his opinion that the easement should be granted to the city at the present time so that the city would be protected if the property were to change ownership at some future date. He stated that it was obvious that the present alignment of Van Dyke Avenue would be preferable to the curve which was being proposed; however, because of its desire to achieve many goals, the staff of the Department of City Planning was prepared to approach such problems with a great deal of flexibility. Therefore, he recommended that the vacation of Van Dyke Avenue be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan provided that the city is given a 15 foot wide sewer easement extending the length of Van Dyke Avenue and provided further that the city be given an 80 foot wide easement for street purposes for a diagonal street connecting Van Dyke Avenue with Underwood Avenue.

Miss Brown stated that condttional use authorization would be required before the proposed project could be undertaken; and she felt that the Commission would probably wish to suggest landscaping of the site at that time.

Mr. Hogan stated that his firm intended to fence their property; and he believed that they would be willing to provide any landscaping which might be required by the city.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Kearney, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the vacation of Van Dyke Avenue between Hawes and Griffith Streets, as shown on SUR-2468, is in conformity with the Master Plan, provided that the city is given a 15 foot wide sewer easement extending the length of Van Dyke Avenue, and provided further that the owners of Block 4813 give the city an 80 foot wide easement for street purposes for a diagonal street connecting Van Dyke Avenue with Underwood Avenue in the approximate location shown in red in SUR-2468, the latter easement to be created at the same time or before the vacation takes place.

PUBLIC HEARING OF PROPOSED PLANNING CODE AMENDMENT CONCERNING FOSTER HOMES AND FAMILY CARE HOMES.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, reported on this matter as follows:

> "On March 6, 1968, the Planning and Development Committee of the Board of Supervisors referred to this Department, for review and recommendation, a proposed ordinance introduced by Supervisor Morrison. This ordinance would amend the definition of "family" in the City Planning Code to include "not more than six persons placed in a foster home or family care home by a governmental social agency or duly licensed agency". It would also exclude homes for the aged from the principal uses permitted only in R-2 and less restrictive zoning districts. The proponents of this legislation are public and private social agencies which establish and support foster and family care homes.
>
> The present planning code makes no specific mention of foster homes or family care homes. The code does, however, specify homes for aged within a dwelling unit for not to exceed six patients as a principal permitted use in R-2 and less restrictive zoning districts. The Zoning Administrator has consistently interpreted the Code as prohibiting family care homes for mentally retarded persons in single family zoning districts on the grounds that they are semi-institutional in nature and in that respect essentially similar for zoning purposes to small scale homes for aged or nursing homes. No interpretation has been made on requests concerning the zoning status of foster homes for children who are not retarded or handicapped, although there are a large number of

such homes in single family districts of San Francisco, licensed by the Department of Social Services and other agencies. It has been assumed that foster care for a small but undetermined number of such children is appropriate in an R-1-D or R-1 zone.

As an alternative to the amendment proposed by Supervisor Morrison which would allow six persons to be placed in foster homes or family care homes in single family districts, the Commission might wish to consider a modified amendment which would permit duly licensed foster homes or family care homes for a maximum of four persons in R-1-D and R-1 zoning districts."

Alvin H. Pelavin, former president of the San Francisco Mental Health Association and representative of the San Francisco Coordinating Council on Mental Retardation, stated that he was directly concerned with programs involving placement of mentally retarded persons in homes throughout the community; and he believed that the amendment of the City Planning Code which was being considered by the Commission could be advantageous if it were to be changed slightly. He noted that interpretations of the existing law have allowed the placement up to six foster children in homes in residential districts; and his organization felt that the law should be amended to allow up to six mentally retarded persons to be placed in single family homes, also. In proposing that only four mentally retarded persons be allowed in single family homes, he felt that the staff had assumed that a greater amount of care is required for mentally retarded persons than for foster children; and, unless there were a real difference in the amount of care required, it seemed to him that this would not be an appropriate legal distinction to draw.

Mr. Pelavin advised the Commission that $600,000 or $700,000 a year is being spent by the City and County of San Francisco to accommodate its mentally retarded children in other single family communities in California since sufficient foster homes are not available in the city itself. Furthermore, the cost of supervising the care of these children, some of whom are placed as far away as Los Angeles, had reached significant proportions. Referring to a map of San Francisco which was posted on the wall, Mr. Pelavin pointed out that most of the city is zoned R-1; and he felt that the city would be better able to find homes within the city for mentally retarded children if the proposed amendment were to be adopted.

Commissioner Porter asked how many mentally retarded children from San Francisco are being housed outside the city. Mr. Pelavin replied that possibly 500 children from the city are now being housed in other communities.

Mr. Pelavin also questioned the advisability of the amended definition of a family as recommended by the staff of the Department of City Planning. He noted that the staff had recommended that a family be defined

as a group of persons related by blood, marriage or adoption or a group of persons not exceeding four persons; and he pointed out that that definition would, in some cases, prohibit orphaned children from being placed with the guardians designated by their parents. Of course, the children could be adopted by the guardian; however, such procedures would involve complicated legal problems.

Helen Herrick, President of the San Francisco Coordinating Council on Mental Retardation, stated that her organization had established a committee to discuss the amendments of the City Planning Code which were being considered by the Commission. That committee had discussed the issues involved with Martin Wolins, Professor of Social Welfare at the University of California at Berkeley; and Professor Wolins had prepared a letter for submission to the Commission which read in part as follows:

> "Without doubt the hearings you hold on foster placement will bring out facts about the large numbers of persons requiring such care, the shortage of alternatives to the natural family, the importance of matching the social environment to a child's past and to his future life. All of these are important. However, I wish to address my brief remarks to only one point--our communities' stance toward the handicapped, the abandoned, the ill and deprived. It is, of course, simpler to separate them, isolate their difficulties from us and avoid being regularly confronted by their needs. This was the way of the nineteenth century. We built children's homes, mental hospitals, sanatoria <u>away</u> from the city. Often we even rationalized such action on the grounds of fresh air, pastoral solitude, the goodness of rural as contrasted with urban people. The sad fact is, however, that isolation is the worst way to restore a person to his normal community. To be of it he must have a chance to experience it, to participate in it. If handicapped he may need help, compassion, more restrained expectations but he does not need isolation. When we close any part of our community to those in need of domiciliary care, we brand them as undesirable and those who care for them as less-eligible, in fact a little suspect. Such an attitude on the part of the community is both unfair and dysfunctional--unfair because it is applied to people whose major motive is to help others, dysfunctional because only their integration in the community can help the dependent children and adults maximize their potential for self-sufficiency and contribution.
>
> In considering the interpretation of zoning restrictions as they apply to foster placements of handicapped and

neglected children and adults, the Commission should, in my opinion, rely less on precedent and the past isolation of such persons from our communal life and more on the examples of integrative programs increasingly implemented in this country and abroad. These people must be able to find places in all parts of our cities. Only a decision to permit this to take place will serve the best interests of the handicapped and of the total community."

Henry Schoenlein, program consultant for the California Department of Mental Hygiene, stated that one of the functions of his job is to license facilities for the care of mentally ill and retarded persons. He stated that homes as such are not licensed for the care of these persons; rather, individuals are licensed to provide the necessary care. These individuals must be able to provide supervision; and they must also be able to provide an opportunity for the children under their care to participate in family activities. Licensing standards also require that bedrooms and outside play areas be of a certain minimum size; and, in some cases, he felt that the standards set by his department exceeded the standards which are met by many families in providing for their own children. Of the people filing applications, only one out of ten succeeds in obtaining a license. However, the care being provided by those who have obtained licenses is generally good.

Commissioner Porter inquired about the amount of money paid by the city for each of the children placed in a foster care home; and she asked if the payments are different for retarded children than for non-retarded children.

A representative of the Department of Social Services stated that the city pays from $85 to $100 per month depending on the age of the children. Mr. Schoenlein stated that any differences in payment between retarded and non-retarded children would depend on the needs of the individual child.

Commissioner Porter asked how often homes are inspected after they have been licensed. Mr. Schoenlein replied that he inspects homes as often as he deems necessary. Some homes are visited every two months; some are visited only every six or nine months.

Monsignor James Flynn, General Director of Catholic Charities for the Archdiocese of San Francisco, felt that it was dangerous to talk in terms of categories of children such as the "handicapped" or "mentally retarded"; and he believed that everyone present should recognize that they were talking about children and of the responsibilities of the community to them. He stated that the basic needs of children - housing, care, food, and love - must be met; and, with 50 or 100 children at the Youth Guidance Center awaiting placement in homes at all times, he emphasized that the community is not meeting its obligation.

Monsignor Flynn recognized that it has always been difficult to find sufficient homes in San Francisco for the placement of foster children; and as many as 50 per cent of these children have had to be placed in homes outside of the city. While he acknowledged that zoning has not been solely responsible for these problems, he felt that it has been one of the things which has represented an obstacle to the placement of children in foster homes in San Francisco. When the children must be placed in homes outside of San Francisco, additional costs are involved; and, therefore, he believed that an effort should be made to expand the number of homes available within the city for placement of these children. Therefore, while he did not ask the Commission to solve completely the problem of finding foster homes within the city, he did hope that they would be willing to remove the obstacle of zoning which has complicated the problem in the past. Furthermore, he hoped that the amendments recommended by the Commission would allow a maximum of six children to be placed in foster homes in single family zoning districts. Although he recognized that the Commission was concerned about protecting the character of the city's residential neighborhoods, he emphasized that state agencies responsible for the placement of children in foster homes would be concerned about such problems, also; and, therefore, he did not feel that the Commission would in any way jeopardize the character of single family neighborhoods by accepting the state's standards and allowing a maximum of six children to be placed in foster homes in single family zoning districts.

Commissioner Porter doubted that anyone would be able to afford to take care of six children for the amount of money which would be provided by the state; and, under the circumstances, it seemed to her that the discussion of whether four or six children should be allowed in foster homes was somewhat academic in nature.

Monsignor Flynn stated that many families in San Francisco are providing care for children in their homes for the amount of money provided by the city. Furthermore, since other counties are paying more for placement of children than San Francisco, it is becoming more and more difficult to place children in homes outside of the city; thus, he felt that it was particularly important that San Francisco should do everything possible to increase the number of its licensed foster care homes as soon as possible. He noted that Homewood Terrace had decided to discontinue its institutional operation on Ocean Avenue and to place its children in special home group care units in residential neighborhoods; and he felt that the state, also, might become involved in a program of buying or renting homes and hiring foster parents to care for dependent children. He believed that the Commission should recognize this trend and that it should recommend amendment of the City Planning Code to make such facilities possible.

President Brinton remarked that a mixture of mentally retarded, handicapped, and normal foster children might result if as many as six children were placed in foster homes; and, since these children would require different kinds of care, he felt that homes with such a mixture of children might become counter-productive.

Monsignor Flynn stated that this problem would be considered by the licensing or placement agencies.

The Reverend John F. Duffy, Jr., Director of the Social Services Department of the Council of Churches, felt that the people present in the meeting room, as human beings, should recognize the importance of "being connected"; and he emphasized that it is even more important for children and elderly people to have a feeling that they are "connected". He remarked that San Francisco is becoming more and more a city of elderly people; and, even at the present time, San Francisco has the largest percentage of elderly people of any major city in the United States. Reverend Duffy advised the Commission that 63 per cent of people older than 60 years of age who have been hospitalized lose their capacity to stand up to life on their own feet; and inadequate housing and inadequate human relationships tend to make life even more difficult for these people. Reverend Duffy remarked that we are becoming a nation of handicapped people with many and varied deficiencies; and he read from the Book of Isaiah to emphasize the moral obligation borne by the community for the care of the poor and defiled. He felt that great achievements had been made in recent years in the care of mentally ill and retarded people; and, as a result, the community is beginning to learn that such people can make substantial contributions to their society. However, one of the most important factors in the rehabilitation of the handicapped is the availability of a family environment since one of the fundamental purposes of a family is to help each other. Under the circumstances, he felt that it was particularly important that the City Planning Code should be amended to allow older people to be placed with families in R-1 and R-1-D districts.

Mr. Pelavin urged the Commission not to consider foster care homes as commercial ventures. He stated that they are family type operations in family neighborhoods; and he emphasized that foster parents must be concerned about things other than money in order to be effective.

Lexie Cotton, Chairman of the Rehabilitation Committee of the San Francisco Mental Health Association, stated that she had had an opportunity to see how handicapped adults had been aided by being removed from institutions and being placed in private homes; and, under the circumstances, she urged adoption of the amendment of the City Planning Code which was presently being considered by the Commission.

Ronald H. Born, General Manager of the Social Services Department, stated that his Commission had taken an official position in support of the proposal that homes in R-1 and R-1-D districts be opened for the placement of handicapped people. However, his Commission had favored the original proposal made by Supervisor Morrison which would allow up to six people to be placed in foster homes or family care homes in single family districts; and they were concerned about the proposal of the staff of the Department of City Planning involving reduction of the maximum number from six to four. Mr. Born advised the Commission that 2500 children from San Francisco are presently housed in

foster homes; and he indicated that a large proportion of those children must be housed outside of San Francisco. When children are housed outside of San Francisco, the cost to the city is greater; and the possibility for parents or relatives to visit the children is reduced.

Mr. Born stated that only 447 homes in San Francisco are licensed as foster care homes at the present time. Of that total, only 27 are licensed for five or more children. He noted that the licensing of foster care homes is controlled by state standards; and, while those standards would allow a maximum of six children to be placed in a single foster home, a fewer number might be authorized if certain conditions prevail. If the children are very young, for instance, only two could be placed in a single home. Under the circumstances, he felt that the City Planning Code should not establish an arbitrary maximum of four persons to be placed in foster homes.

Commissioner Porter, noting that most row houses in San Francisco have only two bedrooms and one bath, asked how it would be possible to accommodate six foster children in such homes. Mr. Born replied that such circumstances significantly limit the number of homes which can be licensed for foster care purposes in San Francisco. And, as a result, only 27 homes in the city are presently licensed for more than four foster children.

Commissioner Porter asked if elderly persons being housed in private homes receive money in excess of that required for their care. Mr. Born replied that in many cases, the total amount of money must be spent to pay for the care which is received and nothing is left for the individual's own use.

Kurt Melchior, attorney for the Ingleside Terraces Homes Association, stated that his clients were trying to preserve the single family character of their neighborhood against great odds. He stated that he had been active in the field of mental health; and, therefore, he appreciated the intellectual arguments which had been offered by the individuals speaking in favor of the proposed amendment. However, he was also aware of the problems being faced in trying to preserve the character of single family zoning districts. He noted that R-1 zoning is intended to achieve an environment for family life in private homes within a city as one of the components of a structured community; and he indicated that it was his opinion that not all placements of children in foster homes result in something equivalent to a family setting. Mr. Melchior emphasized that residents of foster homes are not really families; and, in fact, some of these homes tend to approach an institutional quality. Thus, to some extent, he believed that the placement of an increasingly large number of people in foster homes would undermine the value of the R-1 zoning district which is based upon the importance of family life. Therefore, while he felt that it was important to be concerned about the placement of wards in foster homes, he felt that it was even more important to be concerned about the preservation of the family character of single family residential districts.

Mr. Melchior felt that it was most important to recognize that not every group of people living in a single home constitute a family; and he indicated that his clients had consistently supported the tightest possible definition of a single family. Reading from a letter which he had prepared and sent to his clients, he stated that he sympathized with the trend towards placement of handicapped people in private homes instead of institutions; however, to some degree, he felt that this practice could result in a dislocation of values and that it could have an adverse effect on home owners. He was concerned about the effect which foster homes might have on the process of neighborhood deterioration, and he was also concerned about the policing problems which foster homes could generate. With regard to the police problem, however, he acknowledged that the situation would be no different in R-1 districts than in other parts of the city; and, therefore, he had proposed to his clients that the critical issue to be faced was the possibility of neighborhood deterioration as a result of allowing foster homes in R-1 districts.

Mr. Melchior recognized that zoning laws could not address themselves to the size of natural families. Yet, in the case of foster parents and their wards, something more than a quasi-family relationship is created which he felt should be subject to control. Since a larger number of wards living in a foster home would necessarily lessen the family environment of the home, he believed that the proposed amendment to the City Planning Code should be modified to provide that no more than two retarded or senile persons could be placed in family care homes in R-1 neighborhoods. In conclusion, he stated that his clients would be willing to support the amendment which would allow homes in R-1-D districts to be licensed as family care facilities if the amendment were modified to set a maximum of two retarded or aged persons for each facility so licensed.

Oscar Fisher, President of the Lakeshore Acres Improvement Club and Chairman of the Zoning Committee of the West of Twin Peaks Central Council, stated that he and other members of the organizations which he represented had met with representatives of some of the organizations appearing as proponents to discuss the proposed amendments. He recognized the problems being faced by the proponents in finding adequate family care facilities in San Francisco; however, he also recognized and represented the problems being faced in R-1 neighborhoods. Having had a daughter who was mentally handicapped, he felt that he was in a position to know that it is not true that handicapped people will not affect people living next door.

Mr. Fisher stated that he and his wife had originally lived in an apartment building. However, they had decided that they preferred the type of life which could be obtained only in a single family neighborhood; and, although they knew that that type of life would be expensive, they had decided that they would be willing to pay for it. Now, having made a substantial investment in a private home, he was concerned about maintaining the character and amenity of his neighborhood. He stated that he was not so much concerned about the placement of foster children per se as he was about the placement of mentally handicapped children or adults; and, in this regard, he felt that

the legislation proposed by the staff of the Department of City Planning would leave far too many factors open to future interpretation. Under the circumstances, he felt that further consideration should be given to this matter both by the staff of the Department of City Planning and by the City Planning Commission.

Elmer Murray, Secretary of the Balboa Terrace Homes Association, stated that the Board of Directors of his association had authorized him to support the presentation made by Mr. Fisher.

Giovanni Abundo, representing the Mount Davidson Manor Home Owners Association, also supported the statements which had been made by Mr. Fisher. He felt that placement of four or more wards in a foster home would be completely inappropriate in a single family neighborhood; and he remarked that very few families of that size exist in the city in any case. Therefore, if the intent of the placement agencies was to integrate their wards into neighborhood activities , he felt that they would be most unwise to consider placing more than two wards in any single foster home. The ultimate solution seemed to him to be licensing more homes to care for one or two wards instead of increasing the number of wards in homes which have already been licensed.

A representative of the Social Services Department stated that family care homes with six wards can be operated effectively; and, in any case, life in such facilities is better than life in institutions.

Joseph Balanesi, representing the Parkside District Improvement Club, stated that the members of his organization wished to know more about the proposed amendments. To that end, their secretary was taking notes during the present meeting; and he hoped that representatives of the proponent organizations would accept their invitation to come to the meeting of the Parkside District Improvement Club to discuss the proposed amendments. Under the circumstances, he requested the Commission to defer action on the proposed amendments for at least 30 days.

George Gould, President of the Board of Directors of the Ingleside Terraces Homes Association, stated that members of his organization had been advised by a psychiatrist that a family-type situation cannot be created for mentally retarded children if more than two children are placed in the same home. Therefore, he wished to recommend that the proposed amendments specify that no more than two mentally retarded children should be placed in the same foster home in single family zoning districts.

A lady who was present in the audience stated that she lives near someone who cares for six elderly women in her home; and she believed that that arrangement was working quite satisfactorily.

Mrs. Thomas R. Best, representing the Great Highway District Improvement Club, stated that many of the neighborhood clubs in the Sunset

District have not had an opportunity to familiarize themselves with the proposed amendments of the City Planning Code which were being considered by the Commission. For this reason, she supported Mr. Balanesi's request that action on the proposal by the Commission be deferred for at least 30 days. She regarded foster homes as being essentially a business venture; and she felt that someone should "shed a few tears for the homeowners" instead of being primarily concerned about the commercial enterprises in residential districts. If the proposed amendment were to be adopted, she felt that it would not be long before someone else would think of another commercial venture which might be allowed in a residential district. Then, eventually, single family areas would no longer exist. She stated that she wanted to have the people whom she represented know more about the proposal presently before the Commission; and, if the matter were taken under advisement, she would contact as many people as possible.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Porter absented herself from the meeting room for the remainder of the meeting.

Mrs. John Douglas, member of the Social Services Commission, stated that she had lived in a single family residential neighborhood for 45 years; and she was ashamed at the way that people of similar circumstances were reacting to the amendments being considered by the City Planning Commission. She felt that opponents of the proposed amendment were either forgetting or not aware of the fact that we are living in changing times - times in which it is no longer possible to isolate ourselves from the problems of other people. She urged both the opponents of the proposed amendments and the City Planning Commission to become cognizant of the changes which are taking place in our society and of the responsibility which citizens must assume for people with handicaps and other problems. She stated that people must have "heart" to become foster parents; and, for that reason, she felt that foster homes should not be regarded as a business venture. In any case, she felt that it should be realized that the nature of families is changing, also. Under the circumstances, she felt that people who are privileged should not be unwilling to give to others when it would not hurt them one iota.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Kearney, seconded by Commissioner Elliott, and carried unanimously that this matter be taken under advisement until the meeting of November 21, 1968, at 3:00 P.M. in Room 282, City Hall.

PUBLIC HEARING OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS OF THE CITY PLANNING CODE CONCERNING DEFINITION OF "FAMILY" AS IT PERTAINS TO REGULATIONS GOVERNING OCCUPANCY OF SINGLE FAMILY DWELLINGS.

It was moved by Commissioner Kearney, seconded by Commissioner Elliott, and carried unanimously that hearing of this matter be postponed

until the Commission's regular meeting on November 21, 1968, at 3:00 P.M. in Room 282, City Hall.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio, Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, October 3, 1968.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, October 3, 1968, at 2:15 P.M. in the meeting room at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: William M. Brinton, President; Mrs. Charles B. Porter, Vice President; Virgil L. Elliott, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Jr., James S. Kearney, Walter S. Newman, and Walter W. Wight, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: None.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation; Robert De Velbiss, Planner III-Zoning; Robert Frank, Planner II; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Dick Alexander represented the San Francisco Examiner; Ivan Sharpe represented the San Francisco Chronicle.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meeting of September 5, 1968, be approved as submitted.

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, reported that Mayor Alioto had requested the Board of Supervisors to adopt legislation establishing city policy for acquisition of Alcatraz Island for public recreational, cultural and educational purposes.

The Director advised the Commission that public meetings will be scheduled on October 10 and 17 to receive comments from all individuals interested in the possible development of Forts Funston, Miley and Mason. Forts Funston and Miley will be discussed on October 10 at 2:00 P.M.; Fort Mason will be discussed on October 17 at 3:00 P.M.

The Director informed the Commission that the large number of zoning applications which have been filed for hearing in November and December will require either longer or special meetings to be held by the Commission during those months.

The Director noted that the Commission, at its regular meeting on July 11, 1968, had considered an application filed by the owners of the Sun Valley Dairy

Company requesting reclassification of their property from C-2 to M-1. At the conclusion of that hearing, the Commission had taken the matter under advisement indefinitely and had requested the staff of the Department of City Planning to determine whether another use classification might be more appropriate than the M-1 zoning which had been requested. The staff had reviewed the matter and had determined that the Sun Valley Dairy property, as well as other property in the immediate vicinity, should be reclassified to C-M. As a result, a draft resolution had been prepared setting Thursday, November 7, 1968, as the date on which a public hearing would be held by the Commission to consider the desirability of changing the use district classification of property on the north side of Alemany Boulevard, including the Sun Valley Dairy and Farmers Market, from R-1 and C-2 to C-M. He recommended adoption of the draft resolution.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6270.

At 2:55 P.M. President Brinton announced that the meeting was recessed. Members of the Commission then proceeded to Room 282, City Hall, and reconvened at 3:00 P.M. for hearing of the remainder of the calendar.

3:00 P.M. - Room 282, City Hall

CU68.25 2175 California Street, south line, 82 feet east of Buchanan Street. Request for authorization to use existing dwelling for an eleemosynary institution (San Francisco Gestalt Therapy Institute, Inc.)

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the applicant had requested conditional use authorization for an eleemonsynary institution so that the entire building could be converted to permanent offices for the Gestalt Therapy Institute. He stated that the applicant had proposed to use the existing one-car garage, which is 48 feet deep, for the parking of up to three automobiles in tandem. He indicated that the three tandem spaces would not be sufficient to allow the Commission to approve conversion of the building as a conditional use professional office building; however, because of the nonprofit nature of the institute, he had accepted the application for an eleemosynary institution which would not involve provision of a specific number of parking places. Nevertheless, if the Commission were to approve the application, it would be required by the City Planning Code to establish that the parking proposed by the applicant would be adequate.

Marshall W. Krause, the applicant, advised the Commission that the Gestalt Therapy Institute would not alter the appearance of the subject building which was constructed in 1885. He believed that the proposed use of the building would comply with all legal requirements; and, using a map which he had drawn on a blackboard in the meeting room, he called the Commission's attention to the fact that many of the properties throughout the subject neighborhood are presently being used for medical, dental, charitable, or related uses. Mr. Krause also commented

on the fact that many of the medical or charitable facilities in the area provide little or no parking for their visitors. However, he believed that parking is available or proposed in the vicinity of the Presbyterian Medical Center to fulfill the needs of the neighborhood.

Mr. Krause stated that the Gestalt Institute intended to use the building as a training center for professional people; however, some of the doctors who would be teaching at the institute might also wish to maintain offices in the building so that they could meet with patients on the premises if they so desired. He understood that some of the residents of the neighborhood were concerned about the possibility that they might be bothered by "crazy people" visiting the institute. But he assured the Commission that the institute would be frequented mostly by professional people. A few patients might visit the building, but they would not be of the dangerous variety. In any case, no drugs would be used on the premises.

Mr. Joseph Downing, President of the Gestalt Therapy Institute, informed the Commission that the techniques practiced in Gestalt Therapy are similar to those used in psychotherapy; however, Gestalt Therapy takes both physical and spiritual aspects of the patient's situation into consideration. People may come to Gestalt therapists singly or in groups; and the therapist helps them to experience and analyze their experiences. Dr. Downing stated that the building would not be used primarily for medical or psychiatric offices. His own office is located in Menlo Park; and he doubted that he would visit the San Francisco facility more than one day each week. The principal use of the building would be to train professionals in the practice of Gestalt Therapy. He estimated that between 50 and 75 people would visit the institute each week in groups of 8 or 15; and he believed that the fire station across the street would disturb the institute more than the institute would disturb other occupants of the area.

Commissioner Porter asked how many people would reside in the building. Mr. Downing replied that no one would live in the building.

Commissioner Porter asked how many days each week the institute would be used. Mr. Downing replied that the institute would operate every week-day. In addition, the building would be used for an occasional evening meeting or weekend seminars. He estimated that 40 or 50 people might attend the evening sessions.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked about the number of people serving on the Board of Directors of the Gestalt Therapy Institute. Dr. Downing replied that the Board consists of 7 people of whom 6 are mental health professionals.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if he were correct in understanding that while the Gestalt Therapy Institute itself is a nonprofit organization, the operation being proposed would be undertaken for profit. Dr. Downing replied that the purpose of the institute would be to train professionals in the practice of Gestalt Therapy; and the primary source of funds for the institute would be from student fees. On the other hand, if he were to see patients in his office in the proposed facility, he would be seeking profit.

Mr. Krause, noting that eleemosynary institutions are allowed as conditional uses in R-2 districts, emphasized that the subject property is zoned R-5. Furthermore, while no specific number of parking spaces is required for eleemosynary institutions, three parking spaces would be provided in the present instance to compensate for the fact that offices in the building would occasionally be used for private practice. Otherwise, he felt that existing public parking lots in the vicinity would be sufficient to serve the needs of the institution; and those parking lots would be recommended to students of the institute. He understood that the City Planning Code would require one parking space to be provided for every 300 square feet of office space in the building. However, since only 574 square feet of the building would be used for offices, he felt that the three parking spaces which would be available should be sufficient even if they do not have independent access as required by the Code. He stated that the institute would have a full-time director who would manage use of the three tandem parking spaces; and, in a sense, he felt that those circumstances would be similar to having a full-time parking attendant on duty. Furthermore, he had talked with the administrator of Presbyterian Hospital and had learned that the hospital is proposing to construct an additional 475 parking spaces in the area. In consideration of these factors, he felt that the parking which could be made available in the subject building should be considered sufficient.

Mr. Krause recognized that the Commission would be required to establish certain criteria before approving the subject application. First of all, the Commission would have to determine that the proposed use would be desirable. He thought that the Gestalt Institute headquarters should be located in San Francisco; and he was of the opinion that use of the subject property for such a headquarters building would benefit the local medical profession. Furthermore, approval of the proposed use would be desirable insofar as it would serve to preserve the Victorian building occupying the site. The Commission would also have to determine that the proposed use would not be detrimental to the health, safety or general welfare of the city or its citizens; and, in this regard, he felt that the proposed use would qualify since its purpose would be to help to improve the mental health of the community. He recognized that these decisions would be a matter of judgement; but he believed that the Gestalt Therapy Institute would be a desirable addition to the city.

Philip Adams, 2224 Sacramento Street, stated that he had lived in the subject neighborhood for approximately 20 years. He believed that parking congestion in the neighborhood could not become worse; and, therefore, he felt that the parking which the applicants proposed to provide should be considered sufficient. He informed the Commission that he was a member of the Board of Directors of the Mental Health Society of San Francisco; and, as one familiar with the Gestalt Therapy Institute and with Dr. Downing's reputation, he felt that the subject application should be approved.

President Brinton asked if the Professional Advisory Committee of the Mental Health Society of San Francisco had taken any position regarding the proposed facility. Mr. Adams replied that he was not aware that that body had taken any

stand with regard to the proposed facility. He pointed out, however, that the Jungian Society is similarly housed in a mansion on Clay Street; and he re-emphasized that the subject neighborhood already abounds with similar uses.

Commissioner Porter remarked that the expansion of the Presbyterian Medical Center is being undertaken in accordance with an over-all plan. However, she emphasized that the mere presence of the Medical Center should not be taken as an indication that other properties two or three blocks distant should be used for medical purposes.

John Gifford informed the Commission that he owns three lots in the subject block; and, upon his retirement, he intended to occupy the building immediately adjacent to the subject property. He advised the Commission that his building and the one owned by the applicant share a common wall; and he remarked that there is no partition between the houses beneath the roof. Under the circumstances, noises generated in one of the buildings can be heard easily in the other. Problems of this sort could be shared and minimized by single families; but he was concerned about the noise which might be generated if the proposed use were approved. He noted that the applicants had originally stated that the institute would close at 9:00 P.M.; yet, later statements made by the applicant had indicated that the institute would remain open until 11:00 P.M. While it was first understood that no more than 12 people were to be present in the building at any one time, testimony offered during the present hearing had indicated that occupancy of the building might range from 15 to 50 people. In any case, he wondered who would be able to police the number of visitors or the operating hours once the conditional use authorization had been approved.

Mr. Gifford believed that Mr. Krause would have to receive at least $650 a month rent from the subject property if he had paid what originally had been asked for the building; and he felt that that would be a considerable amount of money for a nonprofit organization to pay for rent. Furthermore, while the Gestalt Therapy Institute claimed to have tax exempt status, he had not found the institute listed in the Internal Revenue catalogue of exempted organizations. Neither had he been able to verify that the Gestalt Therapy Institute had been licensed by the city's Department of Mental Health Services. Under the circumstances, he felt that the Commission should require the Gestalt Therapy Institute to submit articles of incorporation, its tax exempt certificate, and other legal documents which would clarify its status.

Mr. Gifford remarked that the docket which had been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning contained a typical weekly schedule of events which would take place in the proposed facility. According to the schedule, activities would be taking place every day of the week and on most evenings; in addition, staff psychiatrists would be conducting their private practices in the building. Yet, no use of the first floor of the building was indicated on the plan; and he wondered how the applicants intended to use that space. Mr. Gifford stated that traffic in the subject neighborhood has already reached a dangerous state; and he advised the Commission that many accidents have taken place at the intersection of

Sacramento and Buchanan Streets. In conclusion, he read from a book which defined mental patients as those who do what their hearts tell them is wrong; and he felt that it would not be desirable to have that type of people treated in the building next door to his home.

Mrs. Frank Hinman, owner of properties located at 2151 and 2159 California Street, remarked that there are many nice Victorian homes in the subject block; and she felt that location of a medical office building in the block would not be appropriate. She acknowledged that a medical district has developed around the perimeters of the Presbyterian Medical Center; however, it seemed to her that Buchanan Street should be recognized as the boundary between the medical district to the west and the residential district to the east. She stated that parking is a problem in the neighborhood; and, because of the fast flow of traffic, it is dangerous for people to back out of their garages. She felt that an even more dangerous situation would be created if visitors to the Gestalt Therapy Institute were to use the tandem parking spaces which are available in the building. Before acting on the application, she thought that the Commission should clarify both the hours of operation of the institute and the number of visitors which it would attract; and she thought that the Commission should also investigate the Institute's legal status as a charitable organization.

Commissioner Porter remarked that Mr. Krause had testified that the City Planning Code would not require that any parking spaces be provided for eleemosynary institutions; and she wondered if he had correctly interpreted the Code. Mr. Steele replied that the Code requires that the Commission determine how many parking spaces should be provided for eleemosynary institutions which are approved as conditional uses.

President Brinton asked how many parking spaces would have to be provided if the institute were not an eleemosynary organization. Mr. Steele replied that one parking space would have to be provided for every 300 square feet of office space.

Commissioner Elliott asked to whom the fees for rental of private office space in the building would be paid. Mr. Downing replied that the rental fees would be received by the institute.

Subsequently, Commissioner Elliott asked how many doctors would be renting private office space in the building. Mr. Downing replied that private office space would be rented by him and by one other psychologist.

The Secretary read or summarized letters of opposition which had been submitted by Michael O'Neill and Patrick Connolly, 2173 California Street; Aya Kasai, 2165 California Street; and Mrs. Miriam Boehm-Myro, 2149 California Street.

Mrs. Hinman stated that Mr. and Mrs. Marvin Becker, 2105 California Street, wished to have their opposition to the application recorded, also.

Mr. Steele recommended disapproval of the subject application. He remarked that the number of patients and staff who would use the building during the daytime and in the evening would be comparable to or greater than the number of patients and staff in typical medical offices. He noted that the applicant would not be able to provide the amount of off-street parking which would be required for medical offices in a residental district even though that amount of parking would be considerably less than the probable parking requirement which would be generated by the proposed use. Furthermore, the applicant had not been able to assure the availability of off-site parking spaces within 400 feet of the subject site as required for the Planning Code for the proposed use. He believed that the parking deficiency would be detrimental to the neighborhood; and, therefore, he recommended that the conditional use be disapproved. Subsequently, he submitted and read a draft resolution of disapproval which he had prepared for consideration by the Commission.

Mr. Krause stated that the Gestalt Therapy Institute does have legal status as a charitable organization; and he indicated that appropriate confirming papers had been filed with the staff of the Department of City Planning. He also indicated that the institute had been granted a tax exempt status by the Bureau of Internal Revenue. He acknowledged that there is a traffic problem in the subject neighborhood; however, he did not feel that the institute would add greatly to the congestion. In any case, he felt that the Commission should recognize that adequate parking spaces do exist within approximately 400 feet of the subject site.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Kearney, seconded by Commissioner Porter and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6271 and that the subject application be disapproved.

CU68.24 511 Crescent Avenue, northwest corner of Anderson Street.
Request for ten-year extension of 1970 expiration date for nonconforming use grocery store.

Mr. Steele referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He noted that the subject grocery store is one of eight nonconforming corner groceries in the Bernal Hill neighborhood and one of four nonconforming corner groceries near the intersection of Crescent Avenue and Andover Street. Of those nonconforming corner groceries, all but the subject property and one other have 1980 expiration dates. In requesting extension of the expiration date for the subject nonconforming use grocery store, the applicants had indicated that they believed that continued operation of the grocery store until 1980 would benefit the neighborhood.

Miss Wong represented her father, the applicant. She remarked that her father's property is located in a lower income neighborhood which has many young children; and she felt that the grocery store does fulfill a need for the neighborhood. She stated that approximately 300 people had signed a petition supporting the request for extension of the expiration date for the grocery; and she was unaware of anyone being opposed to the application.

No one else was present to speak in favor of or in opposition to the subject application.

Mr. Steele remarked that the operation of the subject grocery store had not resulted in a neighborhood nuisance; and he believed that the grocery store should share a 1980 expiration date with the other nonconforming use groceries in the neighborhood. Therefore, he recommended adoption of a draft resolution of approval containing four conditions. After distributing copies of the draft resolution to members of the Commission, he summarized the conditions which it contained, stressing the third condition which read as follows:

> "The illegal projecting sign and the two nonconforming general advertising (Coca Cola) signs on the Crescent Avenue frontage of the subject building, and the illegal painted wall side on the Anderson Street frontage of the building shall be removed within 60 days of the effective date of this resolution."

Miss Wong stated that the signs would be removed as required by Condition No. 3 of the draft resolution.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6272 be adopted and that the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the draft resolution.

ZM68.21 1904-12 Steiner Street, east line, 77 feet north of Bush Street. R-4 to a C-2 District.

Mr. Steele referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property which consists of two lots which lie adjacent to an existing C-2 district. He stated that the application had been filed by the owner of the parcel which is at present one lot removed from the existing C-2 zone. And, if the application were approved, she intended to convert the ground floor of her home to a beauty shop.

Mr. Daniel, Housing Consultant for the Western Addition Office of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, represented Mrs. Izalia Bible, the applicant. He stated that Mrs. Bible had operated a beauty parlor in Western Addition Project Area A-2 for the past 11 years; however, since the building which she presently occupies is scheduled to be demolished, she hoped to be able to re-establish her business in her home.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked where Mrs. Bible's beauty salon is presently located. Mrs. Bible replied that the shop is located at 1109 Laguna Street.

The owner of the property immediately north of Mrs. Bible's home, whose property was also included in the subject application, endorsed the application wholeheartedly.

Mr. Steele submitted a draft resolution of approval to the Commission and recommended its adoption.

Commissioner Porter felt that it might be desirable to reclassify the entire eastern frontage of Steiner Street in the subject block to C-2. The Director agreed; however, he noted that properties to the south had not been included in the subject application.

Mr. Steele stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning did intend to re-evaluate the zoning of the subject neighborhood and of other neighborhoods which have a large number of nonconforming uses.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6273 be adopted and that the subject application be approved.

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSAL TO DESIGNATE VARIOUS BUILDINGS IN THE JACKSON SQUARE AREA AS LANDMARKS.

The Secretary advised the Commission that a letter had been received from Paul McComish, attorney for the owners of four of the subject buildings, advising that his clients were out of the country and requesting that consideration of their properties be postponed until the week of October 21.

Edward Delger, attorney for Pierino Gavello and Clotilde Perasso, stated that he had not been consulted by his clients until the morning of that day. However, after quickly reviewing the Landmarks Preservation Ordinance, at least three legal questions had arisen in his mind; and he hoped that consideration of the two properties owned by his clients could be postponed until he had had an opportunity to become more familiar with the details of the ordinance.

Dr. Albert Shumate, President of the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board, stated that the Landmarks Board did not wish to be autocratic in any way; and, therefore, he felt that the Board would have no objection to the postponements which were being requested. He stated that he is a property owner; and, therefore, he was sympathetic with the concern of the owners of the subject buildings. However, as President of the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board, he felt that the historical significance of Jackson Square could not be questioned. He appreciated the efforts of the Jackson Square Association towards improving the appearance of buildings in the area; however, contrary to the claims of many of the property owners in the area, the historical significance of buildings in Jackson Square was recognized long before the advent of the recent renovation project. In the 1930's the WPA had started to draw attention to buildings in the Jackson Square area; and a widely recognized book on historic spots in California had included six photographs of buildings in the Jackson Square area. In his opinion, Jackson Square is the most important historic area in San Francisco; and, as such, it plays an important role in San Francisco's tourism industry. To a considerable extent, the Landmarks Preservation Board had been established

specifically to preserve Jackson Square; and, if it failed in its efforts, he felt it possible that the Board should be abolished.

Commissioner Porter remarked that there seemed to be a great misunderstanding about the actual effect of the Landmarks Ordinance. Dr. Shumate assured the Commission that the ordinance is much less effective than he had hoped that it would be.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if public hearings had been held by the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board on all of the buildings which were presently before the Commission for consideration.

Robert De Velbiss, Planner III-Zoning, replied that all of the owners of the buildings had appeared before the Landmarks Board with the exception of the owner of the Ghirardelli Annex on Sansome Street which had recently changed hands.

Mr. Boro, owner of the Ghirardelli Annex on Sansome Street, confirmed that he had not had an opportunity to appear before the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board to protest the designation of his building as a landmark.

THE BELLI BUILDING, FORMERLY LANGERMANS BUILDING, AT 722 MONTGOMERY STREET AND THE GENELLA BUILDING AT 726-728 MONTGOMERY STREET.

Mr. Steele described the architectural character and historic significance of these buildings, both of which are owned by Melvin Belli.

Mr. De Velbiss stated that he had received a letter from Mr. Belli indicating that while he would not be able to be present at the Commission meeting, he was fully in accord with the proposal to designate his buildings as landmarks.

A representative of Mr. Belli's law firm was present and confirmed Mr. Belli's support of the proposed designation of his buildings as landmarks.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6274 be adopted and that the Belli Building, formerly Langermans Building, at 722 Montgomery Street, be designated as a landmark.

Subsequently, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6275 be adopted and that the Genella Building at 726 Montgomery Street be designated as a landmark.

THE GOLDEN ERA BUILDING AT 730-732 MONTGOMERY STREET AND
THE HOTALING ANNEX, WEST, AT 463-473 JACKSON STREET.

Mr. Steele stated that both the Golden Era Building and the Hotaling Annex, West, are owned by the Gavello's and the Perasso's who were being represented by Mr. Delger. Referring to case reports which had been prepared on these buildings, he described their history and their architecture.

specially to preserve Jackson Square; [illegible] sealed in [illegible] at present [illegible] the [illegible] should be [illegible].

[illegible] reported that [illegible] be a general misunderstanding about the actual effect of the Landmarks Ordinance. Dr. [illegible] the Commission [illegible] that its reliance is much less effective than [illegible] it would be.

[illegible] asked if [illegible] had been [illegible] by the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board on all of the buildings which were presently before the Commission for consideration.

[illegible], former [illegible] replied that all of the [illegible] of the buildings had [illegible] before the Landmarks Board [illegible] of the [illegible] which had recently changed hands.

Mr. [illegible] of the [illegible] Street Conference [illegible] opportunity to appear before the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board [illegible] the designation of [illegible] buildings as landmarks.

THE HALL [illegible], formerly [illegible], AT 722 [illegible] STREET AND THE [illegible]

Mr. [illegible] the architectural character [illegible] of these buildings, [illegible] owned by [illegible].

Mr. [illegible] stated that he had received a letter from [illegible] stating that while [illegible] would not be able to be present at the Commission meeting he [illegible] was in accord with the proposal [illegible] designation of the buildings as landmarks.

A representative of [illegible] was present and [illegible] Bell's support of the proposed [illegible] of the buildings as landmarks.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner [illegible], seconded by Commissioner [illegible], and carried unanimously that Resolution No. [illegible] and that the [illegible] Building, formerly [illegible] at 722 Montgomery Street, be designated as a landmark.

Subsequently, it was moved by Commissioner [illegible], seconded by Commissioner [illegible], and carried unanimously that Resolution No. [illegible] be adopted and that the [illegible] building at [illegible] Montgomery Street be designated as a landmark.

THE COLUMBUS [illegible] AT [illegible] STREET AND
THE [illegible] STREET.

Mr. [illegible] stated that both [illegible] the building and the building [illegible], are owned by the [illegible] being represented by Mr. [illegible], [illegible] prepared on these buildings, he described their history and their architecture.

Mr. Delger noted that he had already requested that consideration of these buildings be postponed; and he remarked that Dr. Shumate had indicated that he had no objection to the request for postponement. He felt that the effect of landmarks designation would involve the taking of property without compensation by a process of inverse condemnation; and he believed that it would be a violation of the rules of perpetuity. Under the circumstances, he urged that no action be taken on the buildings owned by his clients until he had had an opportunity to pursue those legal questions.

Commissioner Porter stated that she had no objection to taking these two buildings under advisement since Dr. Shumate had already stated that he had no objection to the request. However, she felt that the legal questions with which Mr. Delger was concerned were not really pertinent to the matter presently being considered by the Commission. She stated that the Landmarks Preservation Ordinance had been adopted by the Board of Supervisors after having been certified as a legal ordinance by the City Attorney; and, until such time as the ordinance is changed or repealed, the City Planning Commission would bear responsibility for its administration. If anyone wished to question the legality of the ordinance, the proper place to have the matter resolved would be in the courts since such a decision could not be made by the City Planning Commission. In any case, it was apparent that not all lawyers were in agreement with the position taken by Mr. Delger since Mr. Belli, who was also an attorney, had wished to have his buildings designated as landmarks in accordance with the provisions of the ordinance.

Commissioner Kearney indicated that he was in agreement with Commissioner Porter. In cases where landmarks designation is opposed only because of questions regarding the legality of the ordinance, he felt that the City Planning Commission should support the position of the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board.

President Brinton remarked that Mr. Delger might satisfy himself that the ordinance is legal or else take appropriate action to have the ordinance revoked if the Commission were willing to grant his request for postponement.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if Mr. Delger's clients had appeared before the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board to oppose the designation of their buildings. Mr. De Velbiss replied in the affirmative.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Kearney, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried 5 to 2 that Resolution No. 6276 be adopted and that the Golden Era Building at 730-732 Montgomery Street be designated as a landmark. Commissioners Elliott, Fleishhacker, Kearney, Porter, and Wight voted Aye; Commissioners Brinton and Newman voted No.

Subsequently, it was moved by Commissioner Kearney, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried 5 to 2 that Resolution No. 6277 be adopted and that the Hotaling Annex, West, at 463-473 Jackson Street be designated as a landmark. Commissioners Elliott, Fleishhacker, Kearney, Porter, and Wight voted Aye; Commissioners Brinton and Newman voted No.

THE HOTALING BUILDING AT 453 JACKSON STREET.

Mr. Steele outlined and commented upon the architectural and historical importance of this building.

John F. Boucher, owner of the building, stated that he concurred with the recommendation of the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board that this building be designated as a landmark.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6278 be adopted and that the Hotaling Building at 453 Jackson Street be designated as a landmark.

THE HOTALING STABLES BUILDING AT 32 HOTALING PLACE.

Mr. Steele described the architectural characteristics and the history of the subject building.

Mr. De Velbiss stated that the owner of the building, Mr. McGuire, was not present. However, Mr. McGuire had provided most of the information which had been obtained regarding the history of the building; and it was assumed that he did not object to having his building designated as a landmark.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6279 be adopted and that the Hotaling Stables Building at 32 Hotaling Place be designated as a landmark.

THE HOTALING ANNEX, EAST, AT 445 JACKSON STREET,
THE MEDICO DENTAL BUILDING AT 435-441 JACKSON STREET,
THE OLD GHIRARDELLI BUILDING AT 417-419 JACKSON STREET, AND
THE GHIRARDELLI ANNEX (REGENCY HOUSE) AT 407 JACKSON STREET.

Dr. Shumate felt that consideration of these buildings should be postponed in accordance with the request which had been submitted by Mr. McComish, attorney for the owners of the buildings.

It was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that consideration of these buildings be postponed until the Commission's regular meeting on Thursday, October 24, 1968.

THE GHIRARDELLI ANNEX (SANSOME STREET) AT 617 SANSOME STREET.

Mr. Boro, owner of the subject building, stated that he had not received a notice of the meeting held by the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board when designation of his building as a landmark was being considered.

Dr. Shumate suggested that the Commission might wish to defer action on this building until such time as the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board has had an opportunity to meet with Mr. Boro to discuss the proposal with him.

SAN FRANCISCO

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, October 10, 1968.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, October 10, 1968, at 2:00 P.M. in Room 282, City Hall.

PRESENT: William M. Brinton, President; Mrs. Charles B. Porter, Vice President; Virgil L. Elliott, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Jr., James S. Kearney, Walter S. Newman, and Walter W. Wight, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: None.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Dean L. Macris, Assistant Director-Plans and Programs; Ralph Mead, Planner IV-Zoning; James White, Planner III-Urban Design; James Paul, Planner II-Urban Sociologist; R. Bruce Anderson, Planner III-Administrative; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

PUBLIC MEETING ON FORT MILEY AND FORT FUNSTON.

President Brinton introduced Jack R. Schonborn, Deputy Administrator of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, who was present to explain the terms of the Federal Government's offer regarding the subject portions of Fort Miley and Fort Funston.

Mr. Schonborn advised the Commission that the Federal Government's Surplus Property for Community Development Program (formerly known as the President's Federal Lands for Critical Urban Needs Program) had resulted as an outgrowth of attention which had been focused upon a Federally-owned parcel of property in Washington, D. C. The community had desired to use the parcel of property to fulfill some of its critical urban needs; and, after that project had been worked out to everyone's mutual satisfaction, President Johnson had created a task force to review Federal properties throughout the country to determine whether other sites were available for similar utilization. The task force had visited San Francisco in December; and, after screening all of the Federally-owned land in this city, the subject portions of Fort Funston and Fort Miley were identified as properties which might be re-utilized under the Urban Critical Needs Program providing that interest in the project were displayed by the local government. Mayor Alioto had expressed immediate interest in the program; and, since that time, a series of discussions had been held to discuss the details which would be involved in transfer of the property from the Federal Government to the city.

President Brinton asked if the word "surplus" in the title "Surplus Property for Community Development Program" had any special significance. He indicated that he was asking the question because he understood that the property at the two forts under discussion had been declared "excess" rather than "surplus". Mr. Schonborn replied that he did not know whether the word "surplus" in the program title had any special legal significance. However, the program had been expanded to include property owned by other public agencies and private individuals; and he believed that the title of the program had been changed to reflect that fact.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if the subject properties had been declared surplus prior to the initiation of the Critical Needs Program. Mr. Schonborn stated that another Federal agency had indicated a desire to use the Fort Miley site; however, that agency had been persuaded to seek another site. Fort Funston had not been claimed by any other Federal agency. Yet, neither property had been officially declared surplus.

Commissioner Porter asked if she had been correct in understanding that the properties had been released by the Armed Forces only recently. Mr. Schonborn replied that that was his understanding, also.

President Brinton asked if the properties were now in the hands of the General Services Administration. Mr. Schonborn replied that he was not certain of the exact status of the properties with regard to the GSA. Nevertheless, decisions had been made which provided assurance that the properties would be made available for development under the Surplus Property for Community Development Program.

Mr. Macris noted that the program referred to by Mr. Schonborn would require that the properties be used for housing or community developments. However, since the Commission would have to decide what use of these properties would be most desirable, he felt that it would be important for them to know whether the sites could be made available under any other Federal programs. For instance, he wondered if any Federal programs would make it possible to acquire Fort Funston solely for park and recreation use. Mr. Schonborn responded that the present author of the Federal Government was to make the properties available only if they were to be developed under the terms of the Surplus Property for Community Development Program.

Commissioner Newman asked if the Community Development Program would allow the sites to be used only for lower or middle income housing. Mr. Schonborn stated that the emphasis of the program would be placed on "balance". No explicit requirements had been set with regard to specific types of developments. Therefore, while the housing to be provided should not create a slum, neither should it all be in the high-priced range. A "balanced" community should be provided.

Mrs. C. R. Thompson, 130 Cervantes, felt that Fort Funston, because of its climate, would be more suited for recreational purposes than for housing. Furthermore, she felt that such use of the property should satisfy the requirements

of the Federal Government's program since easily accessible recreation areas are a critical urban need.

Phil Isenberg, representing Assemblyman Willie Brown, Jr., read, as follows, from a text which had been prepared by Mr. Brown:

"I am vitally concerned that the citizens of San Francisco be given a chance to participate in the decisions affecting Forts Mason, Miley and Funston.

I am deeply concerned that there has been no announced plan to hold open public meetings in the various neighborhoods of the City. It is unfortunately true that only those who have leisure time can attend Commission meetings during the day. On a subject of this importance that is not enough.

In addition, I have received a number of calls from concerned individuals who were not notified of this meeting, or of the October 17th meeting to discuss Fort Mason. May I suggest that you direct your staff to make vigorous efforts to expand and up-date your mailing list. If necessary, handbills should be distributed in the immediate neighborhoods surrounding the meeting place.

On the issue itself, I think it is a mistake to get into any detailed plans or discussions until some broad policy guidelines are worked out in the community. I believe the guidelines should be as follows:

First, there must be ironclad guarantees that the acreage best suited for open space and recreational use may be maintained for these purposes, and be fully open to the public. This should include the historic buildings at Fort Mason.

Second, guarantees that the preponderance of residential housing at all sites be in the low/middle income area. The Board of Supervisors should insist on maintaining design control to insure that the amenities of the sites are preserved.

Also, I wish to outline several steps which, I believe, will guarantee that the most rational use of these sites be the course adopted by San Francisco.

1. All city agencies, including this Planning Commission and its staff, should be invited to immediately prepare a general position paper on the various uses to which each site could be devoted. These working position papers should be immediately available to the public.

2. The City - and perhaps this Commission initially - should issue an open invitation for the submission of ideas, plans and comments by architects, city planners, landscape designers and other creative individuals. All such ideas should be available for public examination.

3. When these ideas and suggestions have been received, and made public, the Planning Commission - in conjunction with the Human Rights Commission and the Park and Recreation Commission - should hold joint open meetings to recommend broad policy guidelines and to discuss various proposals.

4. Only after these guidelines have been adopted, and after full discussion of all ideas and suggestions, should the Commissions make recommendations to the Board of Supervisors.

Of course, at the same time any existing agreements or contracts with developers must be held in abeyance. Also, the City must move to convince the federal government to hold these lands available, while public discussion is continued.

It is my belief that such steps will guarantee a wise decision in this matter."

In conclusion, Mr. Isenberg stated that Congressman Burton had offered to assist in every way possible in Washington to aid the city in obtaining the surplus Federal property for the most desirable use.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Kearney arrived and assumed his seat at the Commission table.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if Mr. Isenberg could define the terms "low and middle income housing". Mr. Isenberg admitted that the terms are hard to define; however, he felt that there must be a logical breaking point between lower and middle level incomes. Furthermore, while no generally accepted definition of the terms exist at present, various agencies, such as the San Francisco Housing Authority, have standards which probably have a certain validity.

Commissioner Fleishhacker, noting that the second guideline offered by Mr. Brown had suggested that the "preponderance" of residential housing at all three sites should be in the low/middle income area, asked what had been meant by the term "preponderance". Mr. Isenberg replied that a "preponderance" would be more than a majority. While Mr. Brown felt that some commercial development might be appropriate on the sites, he believed that use of the entire sites for private commercial development would not be in the best interests of the community.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked how many public meetings Mr. Isenberg felt the Commission should hold before making its recommendations regarding proposed

usage of the forts. Mr. Isenberg felt that the Commission should hold at least three public meetings before reaching its decision.

Commissioner Porter asked if she were correct in assuming that Mr. Brown was supporting use of the sites for housing and that he would not agree with Mrs. Thompson that they should be kept for public open space. Mr. Isenberg replied that Commissioner Porter's interpretation of Mr. Brown's position was not entirely correct. He believed that three urban needs are deserving of top priority consideration at the present time - housing, education, and recreation and open space; and Mr. Brown was of the opinion that the City Planning Commission was the most appropriate body to decide which of these needs could best be fulfilled by the surplus Federal properties presently under consideration.

Commissioner Porter remarked that it was her impression that the Federal Government would release the subject properties only if they were to be used for housing. Mr. Schonborn clarified the point by stating that the Federal Government's requirement was that the properties must be used predominantly for housing.

Commissioner Porter remarked that in either case little purpose would be served by the present discussion if the Commission felt very deeply that the forts should be used for recreation rather than housing.

President Brinton emphasized that the Federal Surplus Property for Community Development Program would not exclude use of some of the subject properties for open space.

John H. Tolan, Mayor Alioto's Deputy for Development, displayed and discussed a series of photographic slides which had been prepared to describe an urban redevelopment project which had recently been completed in Richmond, California. He felt that the Richmond project would be of interest to the Commission because of its design and because of the statistics which had been gathered about people now living in the project. If the property at Fort Funston and Fort Miley were to be acquired from the Federal Government for balanced community developments, he felt that the projects which would result might be similar to the new community in Richmond which has a balanced economic range, a balanced racial range, and a high over-all social quality.

Nina H. Eloesser, 2121 Lyon Street, believed that both of the subject properties should be retained as open space to serve the recreational needs of the community. If they were to be developed with housing, only a small segment of the community would benefit; and the remainder of the community would be penalized since they would have to pay additional taxes to provide the services which would be necessary for the new housing developments.

Mrs. Eugene Brodsky, representing the Bay Chapter of the Sierra Club, noted that Fort Funston is one of the last remaining natural coastal areas in San Francisco; and, consequently, she felt that serious consideration should be given

to the desirability of preserving it in its present state for recreational use. If the property were to be used for housing, she questioned whether families would actually wish to live in that neighborhood; and she doubted that well designed and attractive structures would result if the site were to be utilized exclusively for lower income housing. In any case, she wondered if the taxes which would be derived from any housing development on the site would be sufficient to pay for the various public services which would be required. Finally, while she recognized that housing would benefit some segments of the community, she pointed out that it would not benefit the increasing number of people who need places to go to escape from the pressures of the city.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if the Sierra Club had set any standards for the optimum amount of open space which should be provided on a per capita basis. Mrs. Brodsky replied in the negative.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if the open space needs of San Francisco would be satisfied if the entire subject portion of Fort Funston were to be used for open space. Mrs. Brodsky doubted that the Sierra Club would be willing to commit itself to such a position since the need for open space increases as the population increases.

Commissioner Porter asked if the staff of the Department of City Planning had developed any formula for determining the amount of park space which should be provided in San Francisco. Mr. Macris stated that the planning profession is presently re-assessing its position with regard to optimum standards for provision of recreation and park space. Recently used standards suggest that four acres of park space should be provided for every 1,000 residents of a city. Yet, in a practical sense, the quantity of open space is not nearly so important as its quality and its relationship to adjacent areas of the city. He indicated that the staff of the Department of City Planning, in formulating recommendations for Fort Funston and Fort Miley, was considering the open space needs of the portions of the city which are located near those properties.

Ernest Kerpen, representing the Geary Senior Social and Civic Club, noted that the city had had experience with the "bulldozer approach" to redevelopment in the Western Addition; and he felt that the proper development of Fort Miley and Fort Funston would help to end local opposition to the "bulldozer". If housing were to be provided on the two forts, that housing could be used for the 3,000 people who would be displaced from the Western Addition; and then the bulldozers could come in without any hindrances to tear down everything now existing in the Western Addition so that something new could be built there.

Mr. Kerpen stated that it was his opinion that Fort Miley should be developed with housing for middle income level government employees and that Fort Funston should be used for lower income housing. He understood that to be Mayor Alioto's recommendation for the two properties, also. And, while Mr. Schonborn had stated that the parcels should be developed as "balanced communities", he was not

aware that any such proposal had been made at the local level. In all likelihood, 30 per cent of the property at Fort Funston would remain as open space and 70 per cent of the property would be used for housing; or, alternatively, the entire parcel would remain as open space. If housing were to be provided, it would provide additional revenue for the tax roll; however, if the land were to remain as open space, the only expenditure required from the city would be for maintenance.

Robert Katz, representing the Telegraph Hill Dwellers, felt that the Commission's consideration of the two forts should not use the Federal Government's offer as a point of departure; rather, he believed that the Commission should remember that its right and its duty is to recommend the use which it deems most appropriate for each of the subject parcels of property. If the use deemed most desirable by the Commission were not possible under the terms of the present offer, it seemed to him more than likely that future opportunities would arise through which the property could be acquired for the most appropriate purposes.

Mr. Katz believed that the current national climate evidences a fear of spending money on additional open space; and he felt that part of the reason for that phenomenon was that people so often talk in terms of quantity rather than quality. All things considered, however, he was certain that San Francisco does not yet have a sufficient amount of the right type of open space. Under the circumstances, he felt that the subject parcels of property should first be considered from the point of view of their possible desirability as parks. He stated that his association approved of the Mayor's recent mini-park program; however, large parcels of open space should not be eyed for that purpose.

With regard to the proposal to use Fort Funston for housing, Mr. Katz remarked that a study had been undertaken in 1962 to determine the probable cost of a housing development on Fort Funston and the estimated revenue which such a project would produce. The study had indicated that the cost would be much greater than the anticipated revenue; and he believed that the cost figures would have escalated significantly since 1960.

Mr. Katz stated that he was worried about the fact that the names of large corporations had been associated with proposals for the development of the surplus fort properties presently being considered; and he felt that the city should be a little bit more careful about letting large and dynamic corporations set the pace which it must follow. Furthermore, the public had been concerned about possible "deals" being made between public agencies and private firms; and they had begun to feel that issues and proposals are being prejudged before they have been debated publicly. It seemed that questions were being asked in such a way that the answers had to be automatic. To illustrate this point, he read a statement from a Chamber of Commerce publication which suggested that important decisions had been made regarding the North Waterfront Associates project before the project had ever been unveiled to the public.

President Brinton felt that Mr. Katz' statement conveyed an erroneous impression of the decision-making process to which the North Waterfront development

had been subjected; and he emphasized that the developer's proposals had been made public long before they had been considered by the City Planning Commission or the Board of Supervisors. Commissioner Porter agreed with President Brinton. She stated that all interested individuals, including Mr. Katz, had had an opportunity to express their objections to the Northern Waterfront development at the public hearing which had been held by the Commission.

Mr. Katz replied that he had not meant to state or imply in any way that the City Planning Commission had prejudged that proposal; however, the promoters had been quoted as saying that they had "briefed" various city officials on their proposals before the proposals had been made public. In any case, the tenor of the present hearing had convinced him that there had been no prejudgement of the issues presently being discussed.

President Brinton asked if Mr. Katz were representing himself or the Telegraph Hill Dwellers Association. Mr. Katz replied that he was representing the Association. In response to a further question raised by President Brinton, Mr. Katz stated that the position which had been taken by his association was that no decision should be made regarding future use of the forts without full citizen participation.

President Brinton stated that to the best of his knowledge the subject portions of Fort Funston and Fort Miley would be made available to the city only if they were to be used under the terms of the Federal Government Surplus Property for Community Development Program.

Commissioner Porter recalled that another portion of Fort Funston had been made available to the city in 1960; and, at that time, she had supported the position that that portion of the fort should be preserved as a park. At that time, suggestions were offered that the fort property should be used for residential purposes so that additional properties would be placed on the tax roll. However, the staff of the Department of City Planning had prepared figures showing that the cost of the services which would have to be provided for such a development would be greater than the revenue which would be derived from the development through taxes. As a result, the decision had been made to acquire the land for park purposes. In the present instance, however, she felt that housing was being proposed for the subject portion of Fort Funston not because it would add additional properties to the tax rolls but because there is a need for additional housing to accommodate various groups within the city.

Mr. Macris emphasized that the taxes derived from residential areas rarely pay for the services which those areas require.

Mr. Katz believed that the current position of his and other organizations was that all options for future use of the forts should remain open until such time as the Commission has conducted an objective study to determine the best possible uses for the properties should they be released by the Federal Government; and he believed that the recommendations of the staff of the Department of City

Planning should be made available to the public prior to further hearings which should be held by the Commission on the matter. Most importantly, he felt that it should be recognized that the subject properties at the present time either are or have within them valuable open space. In conclusion, he stated that neither he nor members of his association were against change; however, they wished that the forts might be used for the most desirable use if they were to be released by the Federal Government.

John Jacobs, Executive Director of the San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association, stated that he had previously been concerned about the possibility that the City Planning Commission would not be involved in determining the use which would be made of the forts; however, he was delighted by the fact that new procedures had been adopted and that hearings were now being held by the Commission. However, in considering the issue of the forts, he felt that the Commission should not adhere blindly to the terms of the Government's offer; rather, the Commission should be prepared to state whether housing or open space use of the subject properties would be most appropriate.

Mr. Jacobs advised the Commission that SPUR had prepared a proposed housing policy for the city; and, in line with that policy, he urged that any housing which might be approved for the sites be directed toward fulfilling the city's purposes rather than private economic purposes. For instance, it might be possible that the housing should be used only to accommodate people who are being displaced because of other public actions. In any case, he felt that it would not be desirable to increase the population of the city without first serving the needs of the city's present residents.

Patrick Devaney, 3 Old Chinatown Lane, represented the FSA Housing Committee. He stated that his committee had not yet taken a position regarding the two forts presently under consideration; however, he wished to express certain concerns which were similar to those which had been mentioned by Mr. Katz and Mr. Jacobs. He was prepared to rely on the services of the staff of the Department of City Planning to make the Commission aware that there are substantial and meaningful alternatives to the proposals which had been made by the Federal Government; and, in the event that the Commission or the Board of Supervisors should decide that the terms of the Federal Government's offer present too narrow a choice, he felt that it was possible that the properties would still be available as "surplus" land for other uses. If the properties were to be declared "surplus", the city would be entitled to a 50 per cent discount on the purchase price were the properties to be used for park or recreational purposes; and a 100 per cent discount would be available if health or educational use of the sites were proposed. He, also, had been concerned about the procedures which were first being followed by the city with regard to the Federal Government's offer; however, he agreed with Supervisor Morrison that everything was now "back on the right track".

Mr. Devaney advised the Commission that 15,000 households will be displaced by government action within the next five years in San Francisco. Since the

city has only a 2 per cent vacancy rate, he felt that it was important to keep in mind the critical needs of the city's low income families. He felt that the project in Richmond, California, which had been described by Mr. Tolan had many fine features; but he pointed out that that project was not designed to accommodate families with poverty level incomes. Under the circumstances, he felt that that type of project would not fulfill San Francisco's critical housing needs.

Commissioner Fleishhacker stated that he was somewhat confused about the position which was being taken by Mr. Devaney and his committee. It sounded to him as if all alternatives were being recommended to the commission. Mr. Devaney replied that his committee was opposed to housing which, by definition, would exclude people who need housing which they can afford.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if Mr. Devaney were supporting the position that the greatest need is for lower and middle income housing. Mr. Devaney replied that the city has no credible current data relative to its housing needs. Until such time as need is made in terms of supply, he felt that the city would not really have a "fix" on the situation.

Commissioner Fleishhacker pointed out that the proposal of the Federal Government would provide housing for low and middle income families. Mr. Devaney, in reply, remarked that it is an axiom of political science that ends should not be specified while the means are not known; and, therefore, he would not be willing to support use of the sites for middle income housing until he had been apprised of how such housing could be provided.

Commissioner Fleishhacker stated that he failed to understand what type of recommendation Mr. Devaney was offering to the Commission for consideration.

Mr. Devaney stated that the proposal of the Federal Government would involve construction of low and middle income housing on the site; but it was not yet known how such housing could be constructed. Yet, in any case, the vast majority of need is at the poverty income level and not at the low or middle income levels; and, as a matter of fact, less than 5 per cent of the people displaced from the Western Addition could meet the requirements for home loans for $25,000 homes.

Mr. Macris remarked that the staff of the Department of City Planning would first have to decide how optimum use might be made of the forts before it would be able to make a recommendation regarding the Federal Government's offer. Furthermore, with regard to the question of housing, he informed Mr. Devaney that formulation of a housing policy is one of the current work program items of the Department of City Planning.

Mr. Devaney stated that he would look forward to reviewing the proposals of the staff of the Department of City Planning.

James Browne, member of the Board of Directors of the Council for Civic Unity, read the following prepared statement:

"The Council for Civic Unity supports the following general principles on land use of Fort Funston, Fort Mason and Fort Miley.

1. Surplus public lands should be leased, not sold, to private developers.

2. Due consideration must be given at all times to conserve for future generations, and for the enjoyment of all people, unique features of land, such as shore lines, etc.

3. Adequate provision must be made to provide for recreation and the provision of open space.

4. The people of the community must be given a decision-making function in the disposal and use of the land in their community.

5. Housing to be constructed on publicly owned or acquired land should give first priority to those who need the housing the most -- the poor.

6. Housing should be racially and, whenever possible, economically integrated."

Howard Johnson, 15 Vandewater Street, advised the Commission that he tended to support use of Forts Miley and Funston for housing; however, before taking a definite stand on the issue, he wished to know precisely how the property would be used. If the Federal Government were to provide the land to the city at no cost, he felt that it might be possible to construct economically feasible low income housing on the site. However, the city would bear the responsibility for making maximum efficient use of the properties. He felt that the sites would offer a great opportunity to the city for development of high density integrated housing; Yet, he felt that other uses could and should be made of the site, also. If the city were ready to accept the challenge and to come forth with innovative proposals, he believed that remarkable projects would result.

Alan S. Maremont, 2 Seventh Avenue, read the following statement:

"The disposition of these sites should be made in the light of San Francisco's overall needs and programs. While the city urgently needs to improve housing for low-income families, it also must provide new housing opportunities for middle-income families to replace housing inventory in declining neighborhoods which are shifting from middle-income to low-income occupancy.

As noted by the Department of City Planning in its April, 1968 report on population projections, "A continued influx of a

low-income, nonwhite population, a concurrent outmigration of middle-income white families, and a growing proportion of young people in the city have been projected for San Francisco. . . . If present trends are allowed to continue, San Francisco may become an economic and racial ghetto; such an occurrence would hurt all of the people in the region, not only those in San Francisco." The report points out that "The city need not, however, accept with complacency or resignation a population pattern which it does not consider to be favorable to the development of the community. By thoughtful evaluation and application of city policies, San Francisco can, within limits, achieve the population mix it desires and can provide the best possible environment for its residents." (Population Projections for San Francisco 1960 to 1990, San Francisco Department of City Planning, April, 1968, p. 30).

The city is presently devoting major effort to improving housing for low-income families through urban renewal in Western Addition A-2, which is increasingly emphasizing low rents, and Hunters Point, and through public housing construction for elderly and Section 23 leasing for families. Low-income housing will doubtless be a major component of the program developed for the Mission, once the question of community participation is resolved. In addition, some older neighborhoods are adding to the supply of low-income housing as middle-income families leave.

Through code enforcement, the city is making some effort to stabilize declining middle-income neighborhoods. But this effort is not nearly sufficient in magnitude to preserve middle-income housing resources in sufficient quantity for the city's needs. New middle-income family units, capable of competing with the suburbs for middle-income families, are badly needed. Diamond Heights is the only on-going effort of the city in this respect. While some middle-income family housing is planned for Western Addition A-2 and Hunters Point, the practical possibility of substantial numbers of middle-income families with children to those areas has not yet been demonstrated.

Forts Funston and Miley both have the potential for development of moderate and middle-income neighborhoods which could help to meet this need. They are continguous or nearby to existing viable middle-income neighborhoods, and are susceptible of attractive development. If land costs can be kept within reason, private development under a city-monitored program could produce racially integrated home-ownership and

rental opportunities for middle and moderate income families with children which would be competitive with the suburbs both in quality and price.

Realistic opportunities to replenish San Francisco's declining stock of middle and moderate income family housing are few and hard to realize. If San Francisco is to forestall the on-going trend and retain balance in its population between low and middle income, avoiding the social and fiscal consequences of becoming an economic and racial ghetto, it must take advantage of these opportunities when they do occur. Forts Funston and Miley are two such opportunities."

Commissioner Fleishhacker noted that a representative of the Federal Government had emphasized that the site should be used for a "balanced community"; however, it was still not clear to him whether the requirement was that the forts themselves be developed with balanced communities or that the development of the forts should aim towards obtaining a balance for the entire community. He believed that the position being taken by Mr. Maremont was that the forts should be used to bring a balance to the entire community however, he wondered if Mr. Maremont believed that there might be a way of accomplishing both types of balance.

Mr. Maremont doubted that such a goal would be possible. In developments the size of those which might be undertaken at Fort Miley and Fort Funston, it would not be difficult to achieve racial integration; however, it would be extremely difficult to achieve successful economic integration. In his opinion, racial integration should be sought through an emphasis on economic integration.

Commissioner Fleishhacker wondered if rent supplements could be used to aid the process of economic integration. Mr. Maremont replied that certain "life styles" are directly related to income levels; and, if the family's income level is not achieved by its own effort, its life style will not be compatible with the life styles of other families who are able to afford the same housing. In any case, he emphasized that there are limits to the economic inducements which may presently be offered.

Mr. Macris stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning had separated racial integration from economic integration; and he believed that it might be possible to develop Fort Miley for middle and upper income families without children and for middle and lower income families with children. He asked if Mr. Maremont placed both Fort Miley and Fort Funston in the same category or whether he believed that Fort Fort Miley might be subject to economic integration while Fort Funston would not.

Mr. Maremont replied that the two properties are substantially different in that Fort Funston is much the larger of the two. In any case, he felt that families without children operate under different laws than those with children;

and he believed that that fact had been demonstrated in the Western Addition Project Area A-1. Since Fort Miley is conveniently located, he thought that it might attract families without children regardless of the character of the surrounding neighborhood. However, in his opinion, such a use of the site would not fulfill the critical housing needs of the city. The city's real need is for homes for modernate income families with children who will participate in the affairs of the city; and that need is not being fulfilled either by private construction or by current redevelopment projects. Under the circumstances, he felt that the city should take advantage of every opportunity to fulfill its current policy of providing homes for middle income families with children.

Mr. Macris asked if Mr. Maremont felt that it would be important to use one of the subject sites for an educational facility to aid in the retention of middle income families with children. Mr. Maremont replied that he felt that schools do play an important role in determining whether middle income families with children will remain in San Francisco; however, since the Board of Education controls a considerable amount of land in San Francisco, he felt any needed educational facilities could be provided elsewhere leaving the surplus fort lands free to be used to solve the city's housing problems.

Pastor Ross F. Hidy read the following statement which had been adopted that morning by the Human Rights Commission:

> "The Mayor has announced that portions of Fort Funston, Fort Miley, and in a different category Fort Mason, under certain guidelines and conditions, may be transferred from the people of the United States to the people of San Francisco.
>
> The Human Rights Commission hails the prospect of converting public land in San Francisco from military to peaceful uses, toward the fulfillment of equal opportunity in urban life.
>
> The urgent needs of our City include housing for people receiving low and middle incomes, for educational and recreational facilities, and for the preservation of open space.
>
> We are therefore in full and strong support and endorsement of the special concept that Fort Funston, Fort Miley, and Fort Mason be considered to be used to provide racially and economically mixed housing resources, with attendant recreation and educational uses. The implementation of this concept should be carried out with careful planning and public concurrence and the establishment of firm guidelines with respect to its social aspects. Against this understanding, we applaud the initiative of the City in pursuing the concept of racially and economically mixed housing at Fort Funston and Fort Miley, and we urge that a similar

concept be developed for Fort Mason. We offer our support in helping to achieve these objectives, within the constraints of social considerations mentioned, as swiftly as possible.

We urge that the consideration of uses of Fort lands be directed toward the solution of urban problems that have too often been considered insoluble. Possible uses must not be viewed from what is economically feasible or economically easy, only to miss our great human needs.

The prospect that these strategic lands may help meet some of San Francisco's great needs merits the careful study of the citizenry. Hasty administrative action, however well motivated, will neither reassure concerned citizens nor necessarily chart the wisest course for this unique opportunity. The planning process should include full citizen participation by citywide and neighborhood groups concerned with solving these problems.

Negotiations for the Forts should not be carried out timidly. These federal lands are owned by the people and not by a government agency which has been administering their use. The terms of acquisition must be creative and innovative.

Since these Fort lands have been publicly owned and publicly administered, we expect the continuation of public ownership. We also expect that the highest priority of use will be directed to the highest public needs. Two of our most crucial urban problems are a critically needed mix of housing for low and middle income people and expanded and imaginatively conceived educational facilities.

San Francisco has the unique opportunity to demonstrate bold urban planning of public land. We are confident that once the resolve is made to use these lands toward priority human needs, the people and their government can find the means to do so."

In conclusion, Pastor Hidy stated that he had been disturbed to learn that the staff of the Department of City Planning had been given only $15,000 to study the housing needs of San Francisco while $150,000 had been made available for a study to determine whether Candlestick Park should be demolished. In his opinion, the community's minority groups and disadvantaged individuals should be given priority consideration.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked the Reverend Mr. Hidy to comment further on the Human Rights Commission's proposal that the fort lands should remain in public ownership. Reverend Hidy stated that his Commission believed that the property should remain in public ownership if subsidies could be obtained for construction of the propsed housing developments; however, if such an arrangement were not

feasible, he felt that the public should at least retain the right to repurchase and resell any housing which is developed on the sites.

Commissioner Fleishhacker assumed that the position being taken by Reverend Hidy was that private ownership of the housing should be supported while the possibilities for large profits being made by the owner should be limited. Reverend Hidy replied in the affirmative and indicated that restrictions of that sort had already been put into effect in certain cases by the Redevelopment Agency.

Commissioner Fleishhacker felt that the objective of encouraging people to purchase their own housing would not be achieved if too many restrictions were placed on the owners. After an individual has spent 30 years paying for a house, he would probably not want to sell the property at a loss.

Commissioner Porter suggested that the objectives of the Human Rights Commission might be met if long termground leases were offered to prospective purchasers of any housing which might be developed on the two sites.

Ernest Foss, 119 Haight Street, read the following statement which had been adopted by the Steering Committee of the Defend the Forts Committee:

> "It is the policy of this Committee to defend the Forts from pre-emption for the single benefit of any single use or any single group and to retain the lands in public ownership. A decent respect for the opinion of the citizenship of San Francisco requires that every relevant concern for natural conservation, low and moderate income housing, education and open recreational space have a full share in the planning and political decisions affecting the Forts before any commitments are made.
>
> We fear that the conditions under which Forts Funston and Miley will be acquired will not permit the development of quality low income housing. There are a number of federal programs at hand based upon which substantial land cost discounts and a variety of land uses are available to the City. A full disclosure must be made of those public options and a patient and searching consideration of their comparative economic and human benefits begun immediately. The construction of quality low income housing in San Francisco must be a primary objective for those persons concerned with deciding the fate of the Fort lands.
>
> With respect to Fort Mason, responsible City officials, such as the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors, must not accept its designation by the federal government as "excess". There must be a determined effort made by all concerned

citizens as well as City officials to have Fort Mason declared "surplus". The involvement in this attempt by our two Congressmen is essential for this purpose. Among the social benefits to the City from a declaration of the land as "surplus", rather than "excess", include the possibility that the City could then maintain a green belt and beach front which would connect the Marina with Aquatic Park, using the remainder of the land at Fort Mason for educational purposes and recreational facilities which are critically needed.

We wish to make it clear that it is the opinion of this Committee that there are no social or economic considerations which justify the use of any of the Fort sites for additional luxury housing.

The provision of open space for the purpose of recreation and conservation should not be seen as a waste of the City's land resources, nor should the planning of open space be restricted to that land topographically unsuited for housing. Keeping in mind that the decisions made now as to the three Forts will, in all likelihood, be irreversible, it is critical that open space be viewed in the context of the social and psychological benefits to be derived by future generations having to struggle with the pressures of population growth.

In closing, this statement is not intended to be the last word on this issue. It is our intention to continue to work with all concerned city agencies to the end that the final decisions will be made in the best interests of all San Franciscans."

Lewis Lindsay, representing the Transportation Committee of the Citizens Planning Committee, concurred with statements made by the previous speaker and by the representative of the Sierra Club. Furthermore, he saw no reason why the Real Estate Department of the City and County could not develop the two subject properties with buildings which would be owned by the city. Middle income housing projects have too often been designed to provide profits for private developers; and he felt that if any profits were to be derived from developments on the surplus fort properties, they should accrue to the city itself.

Mr. Lindsay also proposed that special attention should be given to the problems caused by the automobile if the subject properties were to be developed with housing. In other parts of the country, houses are being constructed for people who do not have and do not wish to have automobiles; and he felt that similar projects should be undertaken in San Francisco. Next to the 1906 earthquake and fire he felt that the greatest calamity which had hit San Francisco was the construction of the two bridges which opened the city to the automobile. However, since traffic has been removed from Market Street, many small merchants are doing much better business than they did before; and, in order to reverse the dominance of the

automobile, he felt that housing should be provided to accommodate people who do not wish to own automobiles of their own.

Mrs. A. K. Bierman, 1529 Shrader Street, hoped that the subject portion of Fort Funston could be included in the city's "green belt". She remarked that Fort Funston is a very pleasant place on a sunny day; however, when there is fog, she felt that it would be a miserable place to live. Even though she was a "liberal Democrat", she was not willing to "push" for low cost housing on the site since she believed that no one would want to live in that area. In any case, Mr. Tolan had stated that the project would not be financially feasible unless high cost units were mixed with lower cost units on the site; and, in that case, no one would be present in the neighborhood during the day. Even if the Fort Funston site were to be used for housing, she understood that the area west of the cliff would remain as open space and that only 40 acres of housing would be constructed; and she felt that it would be unfortunate to spoil such a natural area with that amount of housing.

Mr. Kerpen made a further suggestion that some land be set aside for cooperative housing on the fort property with the provision that the buyers of housing units would have to sell the units back to the cooperative housing corporation instead of to another private buyer.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, October 17, 1968.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, October 17, 1968, at 1:00 P.M. at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: William M. Brinton, President; Mrs. Charles B. Porter, Vice President; Virgil L. Elliott, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Jr., James S. Kearney, Walter S. Newman and Walter W. Wight, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: None

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning; Dean L. Macris, Assistant Director-Plans and Programs; Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator; Marie Carlberg, Planner III; James Paul, Planner III-Housing Specialist; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

1:00 P.M. - Field Trip

Members of the Commission and staff departed from 100 Larkin Street at 1:00 P.M. to take a field trip to properties scheduled for consideration during the Commission's Zoning Hearing on November 7, 1968.

2:15 P.M. - 100 Larkin Street

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Elliott, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meetings of September 12, 19 and 26, 1968, be approved as submitted.

CURRENT MATTERS

Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning, reported that the Planning and Development Committee of the Board of Supervisors, meeting on Tuesday, had approved designation of the Old South San Francisco Opera House as an historical landmark.

Mr. Murphy informed the Commission that the Finance Committee of the Board of Supervisors, meeting on Wednesday, had voted against appropriating funds for purchase of property on Mount Olympus for park purposes. The Committee also recommended acceptance of an offer by Black Industries to do a feasibility study of Monorail to the airport at no cost to the city.

REFERRAL

R68.63 Combined Senior Citizens Housing Project and Public Parking Facility at 21st and Bartlett Streets.

Marie Carlberg, Planner III, reported on this matter as follows:

"In March of 1967 the City Planning Commission found in conformity with the Master Plan a proposal from the Housing Authority for the use of air rights for 110 apartments for the elderly on a platform over the public parking lot at 21st and Bartlett Streets (R67.19). In the meantime, the Mission Street Merchants Association Parking Corporation has proposed the construction of a 500-car garage on the site by a non-profit corporation at a cost of two million dollars. The Housing Authority and the Parking Authority have reached agreement in principle on the coordination of the two projects.

The present parking lot has 235 spaces. According to a Department of Public Works survey done in August, there is a demand for an additional 129 off-street spaces in the area bounded by 20th Street, South Van Ness Avenue, 23rd Street and Valencia Street. After completion of BARTD construction on Mission Street, demand may increase.

The site of the project is Lot 29, Block 3616, approximately 125 by 520 feet, in the C-2 zone. The garage will have three levels, one and a half levels below ground and one and a half levels above ground. Thus the effect of the garage on the apartments will be to raise the level of the platform by 5 feet, so that it will be 13 feet above ground level. The apartments will be wood frame construction, varying from one to three stories. Final plans for the housing project will be submitted to the Department of City Planning for review."

Commissioner Newman asked about the rental fees which would be charged for the senior citizen apartments. Gryffyd Partridge, representing the Housing Authority, stated that the present minimum rental fee is $40 per month. He stated that the average income of individuals living in senior citizen projects ranges from $130 to $150 per month; and the average age of such individuals is above 70.

Commissioner Newman asked if he were correct in understanding that no care would be provided for residents of the project. Mr. Partridge replied in the affirmative but indicated that each of the residential complexes would have one resident attendant.

Commissioner Elliott had asked how many parking stalls would be provided in the proposed garage. Mr. Partridge replied that the feasibility study which

had been done to date indicated that approximately 539 parking stalls could be accommodated in the proposed structure.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if the proposed project would require transfer of ownership of the subject property from the city to the non-profit organization which would be operating the garage.

Jack K. Dooling, representing the non-profit corporation, replied that the city would retain the title to the property.

Commissioner Porter, noting that the senior citizen apartments would be located on a platform 13 feet above the ground, asked if elevator service would be available from the ground to the apartments. Mr. Partridge replied that at least two elevators would provide service from the ground to all levels of the apartment complex. In addition, a ramp would be provided from the ground to the platform above the garage.

Commissioner Porter asked if people in their early sixties would qualify as tenants for the proposed project. Mr. Partridge replied that individuals 63 years of age and older are eligible.

Commissioner Newman remarked that the proposed project appeared to involve an excellent use of available space; however, he wondered if similar air rights projects had proven successful elsewhere. Mr. Partridge replied that he was not familiar with any other project which had involved construction of housing over a garage. In New York, public housing has been built over freeways; however, noise and fumes from the automobiles had rendered those projects somewhat unsatisfactory. He was confident that the project which was presently being proposed would not experience such problems.

Commissioner Newman asked if similar projects were presently being planned by the Housing Authority. Mr. Partridge indicated that he hoped that the present project would establish a precedent. In the future, it might be possible to construct public housing projects over libraries or similar public buildings.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if the proposed garage would be used during the daytime only. On receiving an affirmative response from Mr. Dooling, he asked if, under those circumstances, the garage would be economically feasible. Mr. Dooling again replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if any promise would have to be made by the city to cover any deficits which might be realized by the garage. Mr. Dooling stated that the present premise was that no city back-up would be needed; however, he indicated that more detailed feasibility studies were yet to be undertaken.

Commissioner Wight inquired if elevators would lead directly from the garage to the apartments. Mr. Partridge replied that final plans for the project

had not been prepared. He indicated that the Housing Authority had been advised that it could legally specify that tenants of the proposed project should not own automobiles; and, if that were to be the case, direct access from the garage would not be so important.

Mr. Murphy recommended that he be authorized to report that the project is in conformity with the Master Plan.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the Assistant Director be authorized to report that the proposed combined senior citizen housing project and public parking garage at 21st and Bartlett Streets is in conformity with the Master Plan.

At 2:50 P.M. President Brinton announced that the meeting was recessed. Members of the Commission then proceeded to Room 282, City Hall, and reconvened at 3:05 P.M. for hearing of the remainder of the calendar.

3:05 P.M. - Room 282, City Hall

PUBLIC MEETING ON FORT MASON

President Brinton stated that he had invited T. E. Hannon, Regional Administrator of the General Services Administration, to be present at this meeting to describe the federal government's position with regard to Fort Mason. Mr. Hannon was scheduled to be out of the city; however, he had submitted a letter to the Commission which read, in part, as follows:

> "The approximately 40 acres on the westerly portion of Fort Mason, excess to the needs of the Department of Defense, are being held by the General Services Administration to meet an urgent need on the part of the Federal Government for office and parking space. Until these needs are met in some way, the property will not be available for sale.
>
> Rather than use this particular property for office and parking purposes, we are attempting to meet our needs by an exchange. During preliminary discussions with various interested parties, City officials made known to us their concern over the future disposition of Fort Mason. Recognizing this legitimate concern, we agreed to work closely with them in concluding an exchange which we hope will be beneficial to both the Federal Government and the people of San Francisco.
>
> We understand City officials are presently exploring the possibility of actually acquiring these 40 acres of excess land at Fort Mason in exchange for which the City would provide a suitable office building of equal value for the Federal Government

in San Francisco. We understand further that they are also exploring with the Department of Defense the possibility of having the remaining 27 acres of Fort Mason declared excess in exchange for which the City would provide suitable military housing elsewhere.

Should either of these exchanges take place, the City would in effect be paying the full market value for the Fort Mason property and would, therefore, acquire title unencumbered with any restrictions as to its use.

At the present time, discussions with City officials are only exploratory in nature and no commitments of any kind have been made on the part of the Federal or City Governments.

I think you can appreciate that undertakings of this type take considerable time and we do not expect this particular exchange to be an exception. As a matter of fact, we have agreed not to take any final action until we have some indication from the Department of Defense on whether the balance of Fort Mason will become available for exchange purposes."

President Brinton then read from a written memorandum which he had prepared as follows:

"1. Over the period from 1963 through 1967 the Army has reported to the General Services Administration that approximately 40 acres of land and several piers at Fort Mason were excess to its needs. When a site is declared excess G.S.A. first ascertains whether any other Federal Agency, including G.S.A., needs the property. If not, the land is declared surplus to the needs of the Federal Government. It can then be made available through the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, for educational, recreational, or similar uses at varying discounts from the fair market value. Otherwise the surplus land is sold to the highest bidder.

2. In the case of Fort Mason G.S.A. has determined that there <u>is</u> a Federal need for the property so it has not been declared surplus. The Government requires 700,000 square feet of additional office space in San Francisco. At current construction figures this would cost over $20,000,000, including the cost of the site. It has proposed, therefore, to trade the 40 acres of excess land at Fort Mason, and possibly certain other properties which are excess to its needs in San Francisco and elsewhere, for a new Federal Building. This means that the site will not be

declared surplus and it will not be available for park, recreational, or similar uses. G.S.A. has the power to make such exchanges under Federal law and has consummated perhaps a dozen of them in various parts of the country. Fort Mason, however, would be the largest exchange which has been undertaken thus far.

3. Nearly a year ago G.S.A. advertised for exchange proposals in the Wall Street Journal and other publications. It received a large number of inquiries, but these were narrowed down to about half a dozen firms who were seriously interested and who had the capability and financial capacity to develop the Fort Mason site and build a $20,000,000 Federal Building.

4. The City of San Francisco became involved in the project when Mayor Alioto met with Lawson B. Knott, Jr., the Administrator of G.S.A., in Washington on July 23, 1968. At that meeting the Mayor suggested that the City might undertake to provide the new Federal Building in return for the 40 acres of excess land at Fort Mason. The City would then be the agency which would conduct negotiations with the various potential developers. G.S.A., however, would still have to be satisfied that it was obtaining fair value for the land in the form of an acceptable Federal Building. Obviously, no meaningful proposals can be made by prospective developers until the City, through its Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors, has determined what use may be made of the property and how much of the land can be built upon. The developer will also have to provide a site for the new Federal Building. G.S.A. has indicated that it would prefer a location near the existing Federal Building. Some consideration has been given to a parcel on Van Ness Avenue at Turk Street, presently under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, but other possible locations are being considered.

5. If the property at Fort Mason is zoned for development, competitive proposals will be entertained from parties who have the capacity to develop the site within the approved land-use plan and who can build a Federal Building which will be acceptable to G.S.A. If not, G.S.A. has stated that the 40 acres will be retained in excess category until funds are appropriated which would enable G.S.A. to develop the land for other Federal purposes. It will not be declared surplus, however, and will not be made available for park, recreational, or educational purposes.

6. Only after a decision is reached regarding use of the land can feasibility studies be made and proposals submitted to the City for development of the 40 acres at Fort Mason and construction of the Federal Building. The successful proposal would, of course, have to be acceptable to G.S.A. as well as the City. If an agreement is entered into between a developer, the City, and G.S.A., final plans and specifications for the Federal Building would be prepared and the building built by the successful developer. Upon completion of the exchange, he would receive title to the 40 acres of excess land.

7. In addition to the parcel which has already been declared excess at Fort Mason, there are approximately 30 acres which are currently being used by the Army in connection with the Oakland Army Base, the Western Area Military Traffic Management and Terminal Service (MTM&TS), and the Logistical Control Office, Pacific. The Commander of the Western Area MTM&TS also heads the Oakland Army Base. He resides in quarters at Fort Mason but he and his staff work at the Oakland Army Base. There are 44 sets of quarters at Fort Mason for personnel who are, for the most part, employed at the Oakland Army Base. In addition there is an important 300 man logistical control installation at Fort Mason.

8. It became apparent during the negotiations with G.S.A. that optimum development of Fort Mason could best be accomplished if the entire 70 acres were declared excess. The 30 additional acres would permit development of a roughly square parcel with frontage on Van Ness to the East, Bay to the South, Laguna to the West, and the San Francisco Bay to the North. If the operations of the MTM&TS could be conducted from the new Federal Building, rather than the Oakland Army Base; if the logistical command could also be relocated; and if the personnel now housed at Fort Mason could be accommodated at the Presidio, the Commander and his staff would not have to commute to Oakland and the Oakland Army Base operation might be conducted from the East Bay by a deputy with a relatively small staff. All three moves would have to be approved by the Army, however, which has no present intention of declaring the land excess and would only do so if it received firm and binding assurances that the office space, housing, and administrative facilities would meet its criteria.

9. The Army has indicated in preliminary talks that if it can obtain suitable replacement housing for the quarters at Fort Mason (which would presumably be built by the developer at the Presidio), if adequate space is made available in the new Federal Building to accommodate the Western Area MTM&TS, and if the logistical control

headquarters can be relocated in another facility, the balance of Fort Mason might be declared excess. This phase of the project is merely in the discussion stage, however, and there are so many complex problems involved that a special act of Congress might be required. At present the only property available for development at Fort Mason is the 40 acre site which was declared excess to the Army's needs in 1967.

10. G.S.A.'s principal concern in this transaction is to see that the Federal Government receives fair value for the Fort Mason property. To the extent that G.S.A.'s exchange program enables it to build Federal facilities without obtaining Congressional appropriations, the exchange will undoubtedly have to be approved by those agencies in the Federal Government which are concerned with appropriations and expenditures. Unless these agencies, including the interested Committees of Congress, are satisfied that the proposed exchange is in the best interests of the Federal Government, the land at Fort Mason will remain in Federal hands."

President Brinton stated that a letter had been received from Eleanor Rossi Crabtree, President of the San Francisco Women's Chamber of Commerce, urging the Commission, in its studies of Fort Mason, Fort Miley and Fort Funston, to take into consideration the great need for open spaces and recreational areas in San Francisco. She acknowledged that San Francisco does need new housing; but she felt that housing should not be provided at the price of losing potential parks and recreation land.

President Brinton indicated that a letter had also been received from Alan S. Hart, District Engineer for the State Division of Highways, which read, in part, as follows:

"In connection with studies for location of Interstate Route 480 in San Francisco, the Division studied a number of alternatives between the end of the Embarcadero Freeway and Golden Gate Bridge. The only practical alternatives passed through the southerly part of Fort Mason.

Although the Division's recommended location for this route had been endorsed by a joint study committee composed of City Department Heads, the Board of Supervisors did not approve the project. However, Route 480 is still an authorized route in the State Highway System, although not on the Federal Aid Interstate System, and it is our opinion that a high capacity traffic facility in this corridor to connect the Golden Gate Bridge with the Embarcadero Freeway will ultimately be required to accommodate the continuing development of San Francisco.

The need for the freeway was demonstrated by our studies. These studies also demonstrated that a freeway could be located to minimize intrusion into established areas in a way sensitive to the total environment of the city.

As the Fort Mason property offers the most practical location for a future highway corridor, I urge you to seriously consider a provision for a freeway as part of the future use of this land."

John H. Tolan, Mayor Alioto's Deputy for Development, advised the Commission that no discussions had taken place regarding acquisition of any of the forts which did not presume that the city would be involved in the chain of ownership of the property; furthermore, the open space needs of the city and the desirability of acquiring ocean or bay frontage had been given full consideration. No thought had ever been given to the development of any of the forts from border to border; and, in cases where possible developments had been considered, it had always been made clear that final land use plans for the forts would have to be approved by the City Planning Commission and by the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Tolan stated that potential developers who had approached the GSA had been advised that 60 or 99 year leases on the property might be offered to private developers. Such leases would be consistent with the economic life of any development which might be placed on the properties at the present time; and the properties could be returned to full public use when those leases expire. None of the potential developers had raised any objection to the proposed lease arrangment.

Mr. Tolan subsequently read two letters which had been prepared by Mayor Alioto on the subject of Fort Mason.

The first letter, addressed to Thomas B. Morris, Assistant Secretary of Defense, read as follows:

"At our meeting on July 24, you suggested I address a preliminary proposal to you and to the General Services Administration regarding development of Fort Mason. Since that time, considerable interest in the matter has developed locally and public hearings will be held shortly to determine what use is to be made of the property, assuming that it is made available by the General Services Administration and the Army.

You will recall that a little more than half of Fort Mason has been declared excess by the Army and is available for an exchange between the General Services Administration and the City of San Francisco, which would provide a new Federal building in return for the land. The balance of the post, however, is being utilized by the Military Traffic Management

and Terminal Service, primarily for housing. In discussions which have been held with representatives of MTM&TS in Oakland and in Washington, the opinion was expressed that if satisfactory equivalent housing were provided at the Presidio or elsewhere, and if the administrative functions now being carried out at Fort Mason could be conducted in a new Federal building in San Francisco, then it might be possible to declare the balance of Fort Mason excess. This, of course, would be most gratifying to the City of San Francisco since it would restore a large amount of valuable land to our tax rolls and would permit development of the entire 70 acres as a unit.

It is my understanding that there is space available at the Presidio to build the quarters required, and that the Department of Defense has the authority to enter into an exchange of this nature as a part of its military construction program. We have been told that the land would be declared "conditionally excess" assuming that the details of location, design, and construction can be worked out to the satisfaction of the Army. An exchange could then be consummated between General Services Administration and the City.

We are most anxious to speed this project on its way, but nothing can be done until a firm decision is reached with regard to zoning and land-use plans. Once these matters have been resolved, the prospective developers will be able to meet with representatives of the Army and the City to see whether an exchange can be worked out."

The second letter, addressed to Lawson B. Knott, Administrator of the General Services Administration, read as follows:

"I have delayed answering your letter of September 19 because of complications which have arisen regarding the Fort Mason project. As you have undoubtedly heard, there has been a certain amount of controversy regarding our plans for development of the site. I regret that the General Services Administration has been misquoted and that its position has been misrepresented, but you may rest assured the record will be set straight in the course of the public hearings which will be held shortly.

At the moment our Planning Director, Mr. Allan B. Jacobs, is preparing a general plan of development for Fort Mason based upon the assumption that all of the Fort will ultimately be made available to the City. This plan will be considered in the light of the public hearings and the recommendations of interested groups of citizens. Only after

our Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors have approved a definite zoning and land-use plan will the prospective developers be able to submit meaningful proposals for consideration by the City and the General Services Administration.

There have been suggestions that the Fort be devoted to park or recreational purposes, but we have pointed out to these groups -- and it will be made clear at the hearings -- that G.S.A. does not intend to relinquish the property unless it receives an adequate Federal building in exchange. Since the City does not have funds with which to acquire Fort Mason and since no developer would be interested in providing a Federal building unless he could utilize most of the Fort Mason site, it appears that an exchange will not be possible unless: (a) the Army relinquishes the balance of the post, (b) a zoning and land-use plan is adopted permitting development of the bulk of the property, and (c) the project is considered financially feasible and attractive to prospective developers.

You state in your letter that legislation will be required to obtain the additional acreage from the Army. At the meeting with Assistant Secretary Morris, and in subsequent conversations with Mr. Moody, I gained the impression that the land might be declared "conditionally excess" by the Army if adequate housing could be provided at the Presidio to replace the existing quarters at Fort Mason, and that special legislation might not be necessary. In any event, we intend to pursue the matter with the local representatives of the Military Traffic Management and Terminal Service, the Sixth Army Headquarters and the Pentagon.

Hearings on Fort Mason will be held by our Planning Commission on October 17 and October 24. We should then be able to determine whether the exchange you have suggested is feasible. If so, the City will submit for your consideration a preliminary plan for acquisition of the property and construction of the Federal building.

Wilbur Vestnys, Assistant Superintendent of the San Francisco Unified School District, advised the Commission that the Board of Education, in response to a request made in 1966 by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, had indicated a desire for approximately 16 acres of property in Fort Mason if it were to be declared surplus. The Board's intention at that time was to use the property for a new secondary school. Mr. Vestnys stated that San Francisco is faced with an increasing student population; and he felt that the need for new structures to meet the requirements of the Board's new educational program should be recognized.

He noted that students from Galileo High School are already attending classes in buildings which are being leased from the Army in Fort Mason; and, since the size of classes in the schools is being reduced, a great deal more classroom space will be needed within the next few years to accommodate the additional 900 teachers which will be hired. Under the circumstances, the Board of Education and the Superintendent of schools wished to reaffirm their desire to obtain a portion of the property at Fort Mason.

Ernest Kerpen, representing the Geary Senior and Social Club and the Downtown Senior Center, advised the Commission not to listen to individuals asking for the preservation of the historical sites in Fort Mason since those portions of the fort would not be transferred to the city. On the portions of the property which will be made available to San Francisco, he felt that a luxury apartment complex should be built by a private developer who would be allowed to obtain the property in exchange for a federal office building which would be constructed somewhere else, probably near the Civic Center. He emphasized that the private developer could be bound by the City Planning Code and by the existing height limits; that he believed that the revenue which would be derived from the luxury apartments could be used to develop Fort Miley and Fort Funston for housing and open space.

John Jacobs, Executive Director of the San Francisco Planning and Urban Renewal Association, introduced Jerry Keyser, Chairman of SPUR's Planning Committee, and James Hindzel.

Mr. Keyser read the following prepared statement which outlined SPUR's position on Fort Mason:

"1. SPUR supports the city in attempting to gain control of Fort Mason because SPUR believes this uniquely located land parcel provides an exceptional resource that can be utilized in helping to solve the pressing needs of the city.

2. SPUR believes that the Mayor, in concert with the Board of Supervisors, should make every effort to see that the status of Fort Mason is changed from "excess" to "surplus" so that the highest and best interests of the entire city can be served.

3. In accordance with 1 and 2 above, the Planning Department should be instructed to prepare plans that would serve most pressing needs of the city as appropriate for that particular site. These plans must recognize the transportation requirements of the marina and northern waterfront area and should be compatible with the existing land uses of the surrounding area. Subsequent to the adoption of said plans, the city should make every effort to bring them to fruition.

4. SPUR believes that the most pressing needs of the city which might be appropriate for Fort Mason include: educational facilities, park and recreation, low and middle income housing. SPUR does not believe that luxury housing nor office space constitute pressing needs of the city. SPUR also would oppose any use of Fort Mason that would exceed the 40' height limit established for the northern waterfront.

5. SPUR lauds the Mayor's efforts to locate the proposed federal office building in the Civic Center complex and not on Fort Mason. However, preliminary investigation leads us to believe that no federal appropriation has been made for the construction of a federal office building on Fort Mason. Therefore, time appears to be available to fully utilize the established planning and political processes to determine the future use of this Fort. If, however, an appropriation has been made for the office building, it is SPUR's position that the Mayor, in concert with the Board of Supervisors, take every legal and political means to halt construction of a facility which would conflict:

a. With the existing 'P' (public use) zoning that the city has adopted for this land.

b. With the use of this unique resource to help solve the city's most pressing needs.

6. If only part of the Fort is to be released, then the city should plan the available land in accordance with the policy outlined above and in a manner that would allow effective land use integration when the remaining land is released."

Mr. Hindzel described five alternate land use concepts which had been developed by SPUR for Fort Mason and adjacent public land. The five concepts can be summarized as follows:

"1. a. Extension of Beach Street to Marina Boulevard.

b. Use of northern portion of Fort Mason for park, including recreational boating facility.

c. Use of southern portion of Fort Mason for high school.

d. Funston Playground would remain as is.

e. Present site of Galileo High School would be used for housing.

2. a. No roads through Fort Mason from east to west.

   b. Fort Mason to be used as recreational park linking Aquatic Park and Marina Green.

   c. Galileo High School to be merged with Funston Playground and Marina Junior High School as educational park.

3. a. Most of Fort Mason to be used for housing.

   b. Van Ness to be extended to connect with Marina Boulevard around base of hill.

   c. Hillside with trees and Fremont mansion to be used for recreational purposes.

   d. Piers to be used for commercial and recreational development.

   e. Tunnel under Fort Mason to be used for transportation to link commercial and park developments along Northern Waterfront.

   f. Funston Playground to be used as site for new high school.

   g. Galileo site to be used for commercial purposes.

4. a. Southeast corner of Fort Mason to be used for recreational park.

   b. Northeast corner of Fort Mason to be used for commercial park like Tivoli in Copenhagen.

   c. North central part of Fort Mason to be used for apartment buildings.

   d. Piers to be used for Townhouses.

   e. Western portion of Fort Funston to be used for new high school.

   f. Road should connect Beach Street and Marina Boulevard.

   g. Funston Playground would remain as is.

5. a. Sub-level freeway to be placed under water north of Fort Mason to link the Golden Gate and Bay Bridges.

   b. Fort Mason to be developed as large educational park and mass transit facility.

   c. Funston Playground to be merged with Marina Junior High School to form an educational complex.

   d. Present site of Galileo High School to be used for institutional purpose."

Mr. Macris asked if SPUR preferred any one of the concepts more than others. Mr. Hindzel replied that SPUR had not yet made any recommendations concerning the proposals.

William Lee, Student Body President of Galileo High School, advised the Commission that Galileo is so overcrowded that it is on an eight period schedule instead of the usual seven period used by other high schools; furthermore, some of the Army barrack buildings on Fort Mason are already having to be used to relieve some of the overcrowding at Galileo. He remarked that the Galileo school building is fifty years old; and, in many respects, it is outmoded and outdated. When the students at Galileo heard that Fort Mason might be released by the Army, they had hoped that the property might be acquired for construction of a new educational facility to replace Galileo High School. A petition had been prepared which pointed out that the present high school is outmoded and inadequate, that the school is bound to become more overcrowded because of the continuing influx of Chinese immigrants, and that space for new schools is becoming increasingly difficult to find; and the petition concluded with a resolve that Fort Mason should be acquired for development as an educational complex containing facilities for bi-lingual education, adult education, and other related educational activities. In conclusion, Mr. Lee stated that 70 per cent of the students at Galileo High School are Chinese; and he stressed that they need special educational facilities which are not now available at Galileo High School.

Mason Wong, confirmed that conditions at Galileo High School are extremely bad. He also remarked that residents of Chinatown are opposed to the bussing of their children to other schools; and, therefore, most of the children from Chinatown attend high school at Galileo. While classes at other high schools start at 8:00 A.M., classes at Galileo commence at 7:30 A.M.; yet, the classrooms are still overcrowded and the students continue to receive a substandard education. Under the circumstances, residents of Chinatown were demanding that Fort Mason be developed as an educational park. He believed that such a facility would help all minorities and all people in San Francisco; and he felt that the needs of the city's youth should be given higher priority consideration and the needs of a few private developers. He stated that the needs of Chinatown have been ignored too long; and, in view of the fact that acquisition of Fort Mason for educational purposes would help to solve one of Chinatown's problems, he urged Mayor

Alioto to go to Washington to negotiate the acquisition of that property for educational purposes.

Garrett Chan, representing the Chinese Immigrant Association, indicated that he, also, believed that developments of a new educational complex and expansion of Galileo High School on to the Fort Mason property would benefit the community. In his opinion, providing adequate facilities for education should be considered much more important than high-rise apartments or office buildings; and he believed that construction of a new educational complex on the site would be an investment in the future of our city. In conclusion, he joined other members of the Chinese Community in demanding that Fort Mason be acquired as a site for a new educational complex to serve the needs of the bi-lingual Chinese students who are presently being accommodated at Galileo High School.

Kenneth Wong, a student counselor at Galileo High School, invited members of the Commission to visit Galileo High School to see for themselves the present dilapidated condition of the school's physical plant.

James Canfield, representing the Democratic League of San Francisco, remarked that some of the comments made by some of the previous speakers had conveyed the implied assumption that Fort Mason belongs to some considerable degree to the Marina District; however, he had also been impressed by the presence of representatives of Galileo High School who had remarked on the importance of Fort Mason to residents of Chinatown. Combining those sentiments, he felt that it was fair to say that there was a general agreement that Fort Mason is public land and that it must be retained for public purposes. Particularly when the interests of the city's young people were compared with the interests of the private builders who might use the site for construction of luxury housing, it seemed to him that it should be easy to determine which values should be considered most important. He stated that he was affiliated with a school which has to use YMCA facilities on a part-time basis. He assumed that Fort Mason is presently zoned to preclude all but public uses of the site; and he hoped that the Commission would advise the Board of Supervisors that the property should continue to be zoned for public use. He also hoped that Mayor Alioto could be persuaded to use his influence to have Fort Mason declared "surplus" by the Federal Government rather than "excess".

Janice Allen, 667 Parker Avenue, believed that all five of the alternate concepts for use of Fort Mason which had been prepared by SPUR should be seriously considered by the Commission. Whatever the ultimate use of Fort Mason might be, she felt that the waterfront portion of the site should be accessible to the public as open space or for one of the purposes proposed by the previous speakers. She believed that a great deal of consideration should be given to the needs of Galileo High School; and she also felt that Fort Mason's easy accessibility for lower and middle income people would make it valuable as open space. In any case, she felt that the Commission should control development of the site to prevent construction of any more buildings like the Fontana Apartments in the Northern Waterfront. It seemed to her that both the Federal government and the State Highway Commission were completely unaware of the needs of cities such as San Francisco;

she believed that political pressure should be brought to bear on the State Legislature to assure that highways and office buildings would not be allowed to detract from the beauty of San Francisco. Furthermore, since any decisions made at the present time regarding Fort Mason would affect future generations of San Franciscans, she felt that the size of the city's investment should not be an overriding factor; and, if necessary, leasing of the land as suggested by Mr. Tolan might be worth considering. While she valued open space and believed that a portion of Fort Mason should be reserved for such a purpose, she felt that it would be inappropriate to preserve the whole area as a park. In conclusion, she suggested that it would be desirable for the Commission to hold an evening meeting which would allow more interested citizens to express their views on Fort Mason.

Henrik Bull, representing the American Institute of Architects, noted that the declared policy of the city is that Fort Mason should be zoned for public use; and he felt that that policy should not be amended for purposes of expediency. If the property were to be made available by the Federal government, he felt that the city should take advantage of its opportunity to acquire the site for open space. Furthermore, the benefit of all citizens should be considered; and, while the city has no shortage of luxury housing, he felt that its educational and recreational needs should be given high priority consideration. Even if only a portion of Fort Mason were to be made available by the Federal government at the present time, he believed that the staff of the Department of City Planning should prepare plans for use of the entire site. In preparing such plans, he felt that an effort must be made to preserve the low-rise scale of the northern waterfront; and he believed that the plans should recognize the opportunity for improving traffic problems in the subject neighborhood by linking Marina Boulevard with Beach Street. In any case, it seemed to him that it would be unwise to use the site for housing. If the staff of the Department of City Planning so desired, he would be willing to offer the services of an advisory group of architects to work with the Department in preparing a plan for the site. In conclusion, he remarked that the words which had been used by Mr. Tolan made it seem that it was an accomplished fact that Fort Mason would be used for housing; however, he stressed that the real accomplished fact is that Fort Mason has been zoned for public use.

George L. Calwalader, representing the California Heritage Council, stated that the main mission of his organization was to try to preserve the historic structures on Fort Mason; and he indicated that they were particularly concerned about the preservation of the Officers' Club and the Church. He recognized that the historical buildings are not located in the portion of the site which was presently being offered by the Federal government; however, since it was within the realm of possibility that the remainder of the fort might be declared surplus at an early date, he felt that the position of his organization should be made known.

Jack Bartalini, representing Responsible Property Owners and Tenants Incorporated, felt that some city officials might be considering use of the Fort Mason site for 221(d)3 housing; and, if so, he felt that they should recognize that the California State Constitution provides that all properties must be taxed unless

they have been granted a special exemption by the Federal government. He noted that the public had been required to subsidize the land, the housing development, and the taxes for St. Francis Square; and he advised the Commission that the circumstances of that project are being challenged in the courts. Therefore, if the Commission were to propose that Fort Mason be used for 221(d)3 housing, he assured them that they would have a "terrific fight on their hands".

Michael L. Woods, representing the San Francisco Neighborhood Legal Assistance Foundation, stated that his organization was concerned about the projected uses of Fort Miley, Fort Funston and Fort Mason; and he indicated that they intended to take all necessary steps to assure that the forts would not be used for luxury housing instead of for housing which would fulfill the needs of their clients. He remarked that a report which had been published by the Department of City Planning had revealed that a large number of people are living in slum housing in San Francisco; and he believed that the city had not yet taken steps to relieve that problem. Therefore, if the fort properties were to be acquired, he felt that they should be used to provide housing for families with incomes of less than $4,000 a year. Since one-third of the families in San Francisco fall into that income bracket, he felt that such use of the forts would thus satisfy the city's needs. In conclusion, he asked that the Commission schedule evening meetings for discussion of the fort properties.

Gina Zimmerman, representing Assemblyman John L. Burton, stated that Mr. Burton felt that no action should be taken by the Commission on Fort Mason pending further hearings and more intensive study. However, since Fort Mason is presently in the public domain, he felt that it should continue to be used for public needs; and he believed that the highest priority needs were education, housing, and recreational park facilities. In any event, he felt that the property should not be turned over to private developers.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Porter absented herself from the meeting room for the remainder of the meeting.

Mrs. T. L. Gudeman, appeared on behalf of the League of Women Voters of San Francisco, read the following prepared statement:

> "The League of Women Voters of San Francisco supports the effort to bring to the City surplus and excess, Federal property in San Francisco for multiple use. We believe that appropriate public hearings and normal procedures for City review should not be bypassed and are pleased with this evidence of good faith.
>
> In our long-term study of housing and development, we have been concerned that middle income families have been leaving the City - 10 per cent in the last decade. We are also concerned that whatever gains have been made by State and Federal Housing laws have been more than cancelled by shortage of suitable housing in this City.

While we agree that restricting such enormously expensive property as Fort Mason to the exclusive use of parks would not be sensible, we emphatically do not believe that justifies the development of high-density, luxury housing on this site.

The League does not pretend to be expert in land use but we do lay some claim to expertise in the non-partisan protection of government that represents and is responsible to all the people and we believe that the public use made of this public land is very much a part of this area of concern.

We urge that great care be taken with all of this Fort land, so that some of our urgent housing needs are met, and that our fast disappearing open spaces are also protected.

Alan L. Wendroff, representing the San Francisco Bay Chapter of the Sierra Club, felt that the Federal government should be encouraged to declare Fort Mason "surplus" instead of "excess". He believed that the property should be developed as a historical and recreational park to link existing parks along the Northern Waterfront; and he believed that no housing of any sort should be allowed on the site. He noted that the plan which had been prepared by the Bay Conservation and Development Commission had suggested that Fort Mason should be developed as a recreational park; and the report which had been published by that agency had stressed the importance of providing public access to the bay so that people will have an opportunity to enjoy the area's greatest natural resource. He remarked that people will soon be enjoying shorter work days and a greater amount of leisure time; and the population of the area is bound to increase. Under the circumstances, he believed that additional recreational areas will be needed; and he felt that it is important that steps should be taken now to provide such facilities.

Michael J. Cruickshank, 305 Marine Oaks Drive, Ignacio, presented the following proposal to the Commission for its consideration:

> "I propose the formation of a facility for the carrying out of teaching and research activities in marine sciences and engineering. An educational facility where industry too, could locate their marine oriented operations, and government researchers could set up their laboratories.
>
> Many of the scientists and engineers presently employed by industry are very well qualified to teach in their specialties. The bringing together physically of groups from the academic, industrial and government communities, working in a common field, would permit the utilization of a great deal of expertise, which might not otherwise be available in the education of young men and women in their chosen field of oceanology.

I know that the need exists for a coordinating program of marine activities in San Francisco and the Bay Area.

The need for a marine science and engineering facility, centrally located, having deep water access, docks, workshops, laboratories, classrooms, meeting halls, and offices, is paramount.

The Fort Mason facility would be an ideal site for such a center. A San Francisco Marine Institute, bringing together for the purposes of education and research, leaders in academic, industrial and government organizations, with the common goal of fulfilling, at the community level, our national requirement for an "Effective Use of the Sea".

I appeal to the Planning Commission, to withhold any decision on the disposal of this property, until a thorough study has been made of the benefits which would accrue to the City of San Francisco and the Bay Area, through the uses I have proposed.

This opportunity, to utilize the unique natural facilities offered by the Fort Mason site, will benefit the maximum number of citizens, and will bring new employment into the area, new sources of revenue, and will enhance the prestige of the City of San Francisco which has always depended on the sea for a major part of its livelihood."

Subsequently, Mr. Cruickshank described several oceanographic programs which have been initiated by the Federal government or by local or state governments.

Franklin Fung Chow, 1253 Jackson Street, felt that the present meeting was a futile exercise in democracy since members of the public were expected to make recommendations for the use of Fort Mason without being apprised of the facts. It was his opinion that a scale model should be prepared of the Fort Mason site for public perusal; and he believed that tours of the forts should be organized by the city. Furthermore, he felt it important that evening meetings should be held in the neighborhoods concerned to discuss the future of the forts. It seemed to him that some of the redevelopment project areas in San Francisco might have benefited from public suggestions; and he hoped that public suggestions regarding the use of Fort Mason would not be ignored. He agreed with other speakers that a portion of Fort Mason should be used to satisfy the needs of Galileo High School; and he thought that other uses which have been proposed by other speakers were worth considering. He was particularly interested in the possibility of developing Fort Mason as an educational park; and he felt that the Federal government would be willing to give financial assistance to the city if such a project were to be undertaken.

At this point in the proceedings, Commissioner Fleishhacker absented himself from the meeting room for the remainder of the meeting.

Mrs. Bloxam, representing the Telegraph Hill Dwellers, noted that with one exception all of the people who had addressed the Commission that afternoon had disagreed with only one proposal for the use of Fort Mason -- and that was the proposal which had been described by Mr. Tolan. In making its offer, she felt that the Federal government had made an error; but she saw no reason for the city to go along with the Federal government's proposals. She remarked that citizens have the right to criticize their government; and she felt that the city itself should enjoy the same right. On one hand, the Federal government tended to talk of the recreational, educational, and park needs of the people; yet, on the other hand, the government seemed to want to realize as much profit as possible out of a piece of property which the city greatly cherishes. Under the circumstances, she felt that the city should stand behind its present policy that Fort Mason should be used for public purposes if it were to be released by the Federal government. She felt that at least two of the concepts for use of Fort Mason which had been described by SPUR were worthy of consideration. Most importantly, however, she believed that the waterfront portion of Fort Mason should be reserved as open space. In any case, she hoped that private use of Fort Mason would not be authorized.

President Brinton confirmed that the City Planning Commission had adopted a resolution in 1964 establishing a policy that Fort Mason should be used as an historical park if it were to be declared surplus by the Federal government; however, since a new proposal was being made by the Federal government, the Commission was giving that proposal consideration on its own merits.

Gerald Cauthen, also representing the Telegraph Hill Dwellers, summarized the position of his organization as follows:

1. The northern portion of Fort Mason along the water should remain entirely open.

2. The favored use of the southern portion of Fort Mason would be for educational purposes with the proviso that at least 70 per cent of that area of Fort Mason, also, should remain open.

3. This will still enable 8,000 square feet of floor space to be made available for educational purposes.

4. The existing 40 foot height limit should not be violated.

5. No plans should be made for construction of a freeway through Fort Mason.

Concluding his remarks, Mr. Cauthen urged that the city not consider itself in any way limited by the present offer of the Federal government. He believed that the most important thing would be for the city to make up its own mind how the property should be used; and, once that decision has been reached, he believed that the Federal government could be prevailed upon to act in accordance with the city's policy. Above all, he concurred with the motto of the Save the Forts Committee which is "Public Lands for Public Purposes."

Joel Brooks, representing the American Jewish Congress, stated that members of his organization were deeply concerned about the proposals which had been made for use of Forts Miley and Funston. They believed that those properties should be used for the public good; and, therefore, they were opposed to using the sites for construction of new luxury housing. Fort Mason, also, should be used to fulfill the needs of the entire city; and he felt that use of that site for low and modern income housing would be desirable. As an alternate suggestion, he felt that Fort Mason might be developed as an educational park surrounded with moderate and middle income housing. In any event, he believed that the land should be designated as "surplus" rather than "excess." In conclusion, he suggested that the Commission give serious consideration to the alternate concepts which had been recommended by SPUR.

Mrs. Alanna D. Zuppmann, representing San Francisco Beautiful, stated that she had no specific suggestions to offer regarding proposed uses for the subject site; however, she felt that any plan which might be developed should be designed to serve the needs of the entire city. She asked if the Federal government, while owning the site, would be subject to the 40 foot height limit. She also asked the qualifications of the present status of Fort Mason.

President Brinton replied that buildings exceeding the 40 foot height limit could be constructed on Fort Mason so long as the property remains in Federal ownership. Subsequently, he advised Mrs. Zuppmann that a portion of Fort Mason had been declared "excess" by the Federal government; and he explained the difference between "excess" and "surplus" as defined by the Federal government.

Mrs. Zuppmann remarked that the "excess" designation seemed to be designed to bypass all public interest.

President Brinton replied that members of the public would have ample opportunity to testify before the City Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors before any final decisions are made regarding use of the site.

Mr. Hindenberg, a member of the audience, further clarified the distinction between "excess" and "surplus" federal properties. In conclusion, he stated that it was not presently known whether the GSA would ever declare Fort Mason "surplus."

Chester Chew, 756 19th Avenue, spoke of the educational needs of Chinatown and supported the position which had been taken by students at Galileo High School. He emphasized that the bulk of the student body at Galileo High School is composed of Chinese students; and he believed that it would be helpful if a portion of Fort Mason were to be used to construct a new educational complex to replace Galileo. He believed that recent vacancy factors give adequate proof that there is no need for additional luxury housing in San Francisco. He pointed out, however, that the housing density of Chinatown is eight times greater than that of the rest of the city; and he felt that expansion of Chinatown onto Fort Mason would be the most logical use of the site. He did not agree with individuals who had urged preservation of the historic buildings on Fort Mason. It was his opinion that all buildings have some historical value; and if all buildings were to be preserved, no new use would ever be made of otherwise available land. He did support the proposal that a portion of the site should be used for recreation since people will need places to spend an increasing amount of leisure time.

Robert Katz, 2 Whiting Place, noted that Mr. Tolan had indicated that the Mayor's proposal was to use the "bulk "of the land at Fort Mason for development; and he suggested that the Commission should ask for a clarification of that term.

Mr. Tolan stated that a transaction with the Federal government would be feasible only if a sufficient land area at Fort Mason were to be available by the government to offset the cost of any office building which might be constructed upon another parcel of property located nearer to Civic Center. The actual amount of land which would be necessary would depend in large measure upon the zoning of the site which would be recommended by the City Planning Commission. However, the City Planning Commission was not being requested to propose zoning which would produce the highest yield from the property; rather, the Commission had been requested to prepare a plan for the best use of the entire Fort Mason site with the best benefits of the city in mind.

Mr. Katz subsequently remarked that Mayor Alioto, in the letter which he had addressed to the Assistant Secretary of Defense, had commented that the proposed exchange of property would be desirable since it would restore a large amount of valuable land to the city's rolls. However, if the value of the new office building were to be equivalent to the value of the portion of Fort Mason which would be released, the overall benefit to the city's tax rolls would be zero.

George Wu felt that acquisition of the Fort should be viewed as a means of benefiting the people of San Francisco and alleviating their problems. He advised the Commission that 41 per cent of the families living in Chinatown live in poverty; furthermore, he believed that both the suicide rate and tuberculosis rate in San Francisco should be accepted as indications that living standards need to be improved. He noted that earlier speakers had testified to the need for better secondary school facilities to replace Galileo High School.

Thus, under these circumstances, he felt that primary consideration should be given to the possible use of Fort Mason to solve the housing, educational, and recreational needs of the city. He also called upon the Commission to schedule evening meetings in the subject neighborhood before any final decisions are made regarding use of the fort.

Carl Turner, representing the Community Design Center, asked if the absence of any individual speaking in favor of high-rise apartment construction on Fort Mason could be taken as an indication of lack of interest on the part of possible developers or if it meant that the developers were waiting to represent their interest at a more auspicious time.

President Brinton replied that it was likely that those interested in becoming involved in the development of Fort Mason would come before the Commission at a later date if the land use proposals being formulated by the staff of the Department of City Planning were of interest to them.

Mr. Tolan stated that the GSA had advertised a subject portion of Fort Mason in January; and, at that time, several potential developers had expressed an interest in the property. However, all were agreed that no serious consideration could be given to the proposal until potential land uses for the site have been defined by the City Planning Commission. At no time had anyone mentioned the possibility of exceeding the established 40 foot height limit in the area.

Mrs. Strong, a teacher, stated that she had taught both in the Chinatown and in the Fillmore districts; and she believed that most children in Chinatown have not had the opportunity to set foot on natural earth unless they have been taken to Golden Gate Park by the school system. Furthermore, schools in Chinatown are desperately overcrowded. She felt that the future welfare of people who live in San Francisco should be considered; and among the essential needs of people are trees which purify the air, form a beautified landscape and provide dwelling places for animals. If the city has extra money, she felt that it should be spent to purchase empty lots which can be used as playgrounds for children; and she remarked that the need for additional playgrounds is particularly pronounced in Chinatown. In conclusion, she suggested that the staff of the Department of City Planning should secure an expert ecologist to aid them in the preparation of plans for the future of the city.

Mr. Macris replied that all professional city planners are trained in ecology.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, October 24, 1968.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, October 24, 1968, at 2:15 P.M. in the meeting at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: William M. Brinton, President; Mrs. Charles B. Porter, Vice President; Virgil L. Elliott, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Jr., and Walter S. Newman, members of the City Planning Commission

ABSENT: Commissioners Carr and Kearney

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; Dean L. Macris, Assistant Director-Plans and Programs; Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning Administrator; Samuel Jung, Planner IV; Robert DeVelbiss, Planner III--Zoning; Sidney Shaw, Planner II; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner; Scott Blakey represented the San Francisco Chronicle.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meeting of October 3, 1968 be approved as submitted.

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, reported on the annual conference of the American Institute of Planners which he attended recently in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

The Director informed the Commission that a second public meeting on Fort Mason had been scheduled for next Thursday evening, October 31, at 7:30 P.M. in the auditorium of Galileo High School at 1150 Francisco Street.

The Director advised the Commission that the Board of Supervisors, meeting on Monday, had appropriated $186,500 for acquisition of property on Mount Olympus for park purposes.

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE RULES AND REGULATIONS OF THE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

The Secretary explained the changes which were being recommended in the Rules and Regulations of the City Planning Commission, the revised text of which had been included in the announcement of the present meeting. He stated that the primary purpose of the revision was to delete old Article V "Applications" since those requirements were now included in the text of the City Planning Code; however, other changes in the text of the Rules and Regulations were also being recommended to bring the Rules into closer accord with the provisions of the Charter and with the established policy of the Commission.

President Brinton suggested that an eighth item should be added to Section IX of the proposed text to read as follows: "The President may impose time limits on appearances by members of the public and they otherwise exercise his discretion on procedures for the conduct of public hearings."

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker and carried unanimously that the revised test of the Rules and Regulations be amended with the language proposed by President Brinton.

Subsequently, it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the revised Rules and Regulations of the City Planning Commission, as amended, be adopted.

REFERRALS

R68.59 Vacation of a portion of Hollister Avenue southeasterly of Hawes Street.

Samuel Jung, Planner IV, reported on this matter as follows:

"The San Francisco Unified School District has acquired five lots on the south side of Hollister Avenue and four lots on the north side immediately west of Bret Harte elementary school in the Bay View park neighborhood. The school is to be expanded to provide eight additional classrooms and two child care rooms. The land acquisition was reviewed by the City Planning Commission in February, 1966 and found in conformity with the Master Plan.

Hollister Avenue, an easement street, now dead ends on the western side of the existing school building. The vacation of the street area between the newly acquired lots will add 7520 square feet to the site. The present turnaround at the end of the street will be relocated."

The Director recommended that the proposed vacation of the subject portion of Hollister Avenue be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the vacation of a portion of Hollister Avenue southeasterly of Hawes Street, as shown on SUR-2868, is in conformity with the Master Plan.

R68.62 Lake Merced wye - Exchange of property, Water Department with Henry Doelger Builder, Inc.

Mr. Jung reported on this matter as follows:

"The City Planning Commission by Resolution No. 5593, October 25, 1962, approved a one-acre planned unit development in an R-1-D zoning district just north of the county line at the Lake Merced wye (CU62.45) for nine single-family attached dwellings on individual lots grouped around a common open space. The Plan involved relocating the road to serve the subdivision, El Portal Way, northward so that it would not conflict with traffic channelization at the Lake Merced wye. An exchange of property has now been worked out which provides the developer with land for the entrance of the subdivision road to Lake Merced Boulevard an adequate sight distance north of the wye and with a strip of land, 5,151 square feet, adjacent to his proposed subdivision, and provides the City with the piece of land where the entrance was originally to have been located, to be added to the 50-foot landscaped strip bordering Lake Merced Boulevard. The developer will also release to the City certain easement and grading rights which he holds to Water Department pipeline rights-of-way immediately south of the county line in Daly City.

As shown on Water Department drawing D-1429, Change 2, the City will receive title to 99,318 square feet and the developer will receive title to 12,990 square feet. The Director of Property has advised that the respective exchanges of property interests are of equal value.

The developer has also agreed to provide a parking lot on El Portal Way for visitors to the Broderick-Terry duel site, a short distance away on San Francisco Golf and Country Club property in San Mateo County. He will also provide a pathway to the site and will fence certain of the Water Department lands.

The California Historical Society will place a directional sign to the duel site at the junction of Lake Merced Boulevard and El Portal Way."

The Director recommended that the exchange of property be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Elliott, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the exchange of Property shown on Water Department Drawing D-1429, Change 2, San Francisco Water Department, with Henry Doelger Builder, Inc., is in conformity with the Master Plan.

PRESENTATION OF REPORT ON INDUSTRIAL TRENDS IN SAN FRANCISCO

Sidney Shaw, Planner III, presented and summarized this report, which is available in the files of the Department of City Planning. He stated that the purpose of the report was to provide background in the form of a single reference document for public agencies, private groups, and individuals concerned with formulating policies affecting the industrial basis of San Francisco. He indicated that the report had brought together information on city and regional trends and on the strengths and weaknesses of San Francisco's industry. He believed that the report would enable the members of the City Planning Commission, in their advisory role of recommending development policy for the city, to have a better understanding of industrial trends; and, in addition, he felt that information of the type which was contained in the report would be of special importance to the staff of the Department of City Planning in revising the San Francisco Comprehensive Plan.

James Murray, representing the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, complimented Mr. Shaw on the work which he had done in compiling the available information on industrial trends in San Francisco.

Lawrence Arky commented on the lack of up-to-date information on industrial trends in San Francisco and suggested that an industrial development center should be established to aid industry in a way that he felt that the Chamber of Commerce aids downtown businesses.

Roy Anderson, representing Anderson and Associates, also commented on the lack of up-to-date industrial information. He noted that the data contained in the report which was just being presented was at least four years old; and he remarked that many changes have taken place in the last four years.

The Director stated that the Department of City Planning appreciated the fact that the availability of industrial information in San Francisco is not as good as it should be; and, for that reason, the Department had undertaken to compile the best and up-to-date report on industrial trends that it could, given its limited resources. He also noted that the report had recommended that an industrial development corporation should be established in San Francisco.

Commissioner Fleishhacker suggested that the members of the Commission should read the report and be prepared to discuss it in greater detail at a later date.

DISCRETIONARY REVIEW OF APPLICATION FOR AN AUTOMOBILE WRECKING YARD TO BE LOCATED IN THE BLOCK BOUNDED BY DONAHUE, CARROLL, COLEMAN AND BANCROFT STREETS

Wayne Rieke, Planner IV - Zoning, reported on this matter as follows:

"The application to the San Francisco Police Permit Bureau which was filed by Murrary George Cole requesting permission to operate as an Auto Wrecker on the property identified above has been referred to the Department of City Planning and to other City departments as a matter of routine. It has been scheduled for discretionary review by the City Planning Commission because the proposed location is within the area identified in Resolution No. 6018, dated July 28, 1966, as being of particular concern to the commission with regard to the protection of scenic views from Candlestick Park and Bay View Park.

On August 29 of this year, the City Planning Commission reviewed the South Bayshore Study and Proposed Plan, which has been prepared by the staff of the Department of City Planning over the past two years. In the special design study and schematic plans prepared for the Candlestick-South Basin Area, a part of the South Bayshore Area, all of the land east of the Hunters Point Freeway right of way and south of Hunters Point Naval Shipyard is designated for residential, park and recreation or commercial recreation use instead of the heavy industrial use indicated by the present zoning. At this August meeting, the Commission authorized the Director to proceed with his preparations for publication of the plan and to recommend to the Board of Supervisors the schematic plans which have been prepared for the Candlestick Cove and South Basin Area.

The expressed policy of the Bay Conservation and Development Commission, that there should be only housing and recreational

use along this undeveloped shore line, agrees with the plan approved by the Planning Commission.

Although Mr. Cole has been informed of the Studies which indicate that his business would be inappropriate in this location, he has asked that his application be given careful review and has stated the following reasons why he believes that his application should be approved:

1. His present location at 1650 Davidson Avenue has insufficient storage space for his needs and is in the path of a future freeway so that he will be forced to move within the next several years.

2. He would use the new location for storage only for the next year or two, but would eventually move the entire operation to the new site.

3. The Donahue and Carroll site is in an M-2 zoning district and he would be willing to comply with any reasonable conditions to make his use compatible with the other uses in the area.

4. His present operation, when compared with that of other auto wreckers, is a model of neatness and efficiency.

5. He has searched the entire Bay Area for a new location and the only other one he has been able to find is near San Jose, too far from his present business to make the move.

Most of the land north of Candlestick Park and east of Fitch Street and south of South Basin is undeveloped. Two or more blocks are being filled with earth and construction debris in order to reclaim land from the Bay. One new business in the area consists of a small sales building and a large storage yard in which a wide variety of natural stone building products are stored. The block bounded by Egbert and Donner Avenues, Fitch and Earl Streets which is two blocks southeast of the subject property, just over the M-2 zoning boundary in an M-1 district, is used by the Tow Car Association, Inc. for the storage of wrecked and abandoned automobiles. This use was approved by Planning Commission Resolution No. 5723 dated January 2, 1964 under the Planned Unit Development (Conditional Use) provisions of the Planning Code. Conditions adopted as

a part of that resolution required that the entire operation be conducted within a 12-foot high fence, that no open wrecking be permitted, that certain landscaping be provided and limited the use to a period of five years. That five-year period has about two and a half months to run.

The owner of the property which Mr. Cole intends to lease and eventually buy reported to the staff that the last previous tenant was an auto wrecker who had to give up his lease on the property because of financial problems."

The Director recommended that the subject application be disapproved for the following specific reasons:

1. There is a need in this area of San Francisco for additional public ownership of shoreline properties suitable for recreation.

2. The underdeveloped shoreline in the Candlestick-South Basin area is the last sizeable portion not already in private use.

3. Construction of a freeway in this vicinity, which will form a boundary between industrial and residential uses, the BCDC action to protect the shoreline all around the bay and public action to prevent further pollution of the bay makes the use of this area for recreation and residential purposes both feasible and necessary for the public convenience and general welfare.

Commissioner Porter remarked that the Commission had recently approved a portion of the plan which had been prepared for the South Bayshore area by the staff of the Department of City Planning; however, the Commission had not yet initiated any changes of zoning in the study area. She realized that the plan would have little value if properties in the area were to be developed in ways which would not conform with the plan; however, she felt that property owners should be able to rely on these zoning designations which have been given to their property.

The Director stated that it would be possible for the staff of the Department of City Planning to start its review of zoning within the study area immediately; however, he felt that it would be better to wait until the South Bayshore plan is published and made available to the public.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if it would be possible to allow the applicant to use the subject property for an automobile wrecking yard on a temporary basis pending future zone changes.

Mr. Cole, the applicant, stated that he would be willing to develop the property in conformance with the Commission's plan at a later date; however, before such a development could be undertaken, he would have to have sufficient time to relocate his automobile wrecking business. He asked how much time might be given to him for that purpose.

The Director stated that he had recommended that the subject portion of the South Bayshore Study area be redeveloped through a renewal process; and, under those circumstances, the Redevelopment Agency would make a determination as to the amount of time which would be granted for the relocation of existing uses.

Commissioner Porter remarked that the proposed use, if approved at the present time, would become a nonconforming use if the property were to be rezoned at a later date. Under those circumstances, she wondered how long the applicant would be allowed to remove the automobile wrecking yard from the site. Mr Passmore replied than an amortization period of 20 years would probably be authorized under those circumstances.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if the applicant would be satisfied if the auto wrecking permit were to be approved by the Commission for a two, three or four year period only.

Roy Anderson, broker's agent for Mr. Cole, noted that the South of Market Redevelopment Project, while in effect for approximately 12 years, had not yet entered the construction phase. Under the circumstances, he wondered if the subject automobile wrecking permit could be authorized for a minimum period of ten years.

Mr. Passmore replied that he was not certain whether the Commission could legally take such an action; however, he indicated that the matter could be discussed with the City Attorney's office.

The Director recommended that the matter be taken under advisement to enable the staff of the Department of City Planning to look into the proposal into greater detail.

Mr. Passmore questioned whether a ten year authorization would be acceptable to the applicant since he had previously understood that the applicant wished to acquire a permanent site for his automobile wrecking business.

Mr. Anderson replied that his client would probably retire within the next 20 years. Therefore, while a three or five year authorization would not be acceptable, he felt that a ten year authorization might be more reasonable.

Commissioner Porter asked if a three year authorization would be acceptable with the possibility that the permit might be renewed at the end of that time. Mr. Cole replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Anderson remarked that the proposed Hunters Point freeway will hide the subject property from the rest of the South Bayshore area; and, in addition, he indicated that his client would be willing to screen the site in accordance with any suggestions which might be made by the Commission.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that this matter be taken under advisement until the meeting of November 14, 1968.

CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSALS TO DESIGNATE THE FOLLOWING BUILDINGS AS LANDMARKS (PROPOSED FROM MEETING OF OCTOBER 3, 1968): THE HOTALING ANNEX, EAST AT 445 JACKSON STREET; THE MEDICO-DENTAL BUILDING AT 435-441 JACKSON STREET; THE OLD GHIRARDELLI BUILDING AT 417-419 JACKSON STREET; AND THE GHIRARDELLI ANNEX (REGENCY HOUSE) AT 407 JACKSON STREET

Robert Passmore, Assistant Zoning administrator, described the architectural and historical characteristics of the four subject buildings which are presently under the same ownership.

Mrs. Platt and Mr. Whisler were present representing the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board.

Paul W. McComish, Attorney for the owners of the subject buildings, stated that the present appearance of the buildings had resulted from recent painting and redecoration and not from the architecture itself; and under the circumstances, he questioned whether it would be appropriate to designate the building as architectural landmarks. However, if the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board was prepared to state that the buildings have historical significance, he would be willing to accept its opinion. He did not consider himself either an expert on history or on architecture but rather as a representative of two local businessmen who had purchased property in a run-down area of the city and who had brought to the area a new industry and a new vitality. He felt that the effect of recent actions taken by the City Planning Commission would be to destroy what his clients had created and to make the subject neighborhood so expensive that the textile industry would be forced to move elsewhere. He noted that the Commission had established a 65 foot height limit in Jackson Square while

allowing all of the surrounding areas to have taller buildings. Now, if the properties were to be declared historical or architectural landmarks, it would not be possible to merge lots and, consequently, no economical development of the properties would be feasible. Furthermore, while a representative of the Assessor's office had advised him that Landmarks designation would devaluate his client's property, the same individual had been unwilling to confirm that fact for the Tax Appeals Board. Therefore, while the value of the property would be decreased, the taxes which his clients would have to pay would remain unchanged.

President Brinton remarked that the Commission could not delay the issuance of demolition permits for buildings designated as landmarks for more than six months. Under the circumstances, he felt that approval of the buildings as landmarks would not unduly restrict Mr. McComish's clients.

Mr. McComish asked what would happen if he were to file a demolition permit tomorrow to protect his clients.

The Director stated that the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board may have various reasons for recommending that buildings be designated as landmarks; and he felt that the only question before the Commission was whether the subject buildings do in fact merit such designation. If the Commission were to agree with the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board that the buildings are worthy of such designation, he felt that the designations should be approved. Subsequently, if the owners of the buildings wished to demolish the buildings, the Commission could exercise its legal right to delay approval of the demolition permit for a maximum of six months to enable any interested individuals or groups to purchase and preserve the buildings at a price which would be agreeable to the present owners. Beyond that point, the Commission could not forbid demolition of the building if the owners did not wish to sell the property.

Mr. McComish distributed copies of a letter which the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board had submitted to the Board of Supervisors in support of the 65 foot height limit proposed for Jackson Square. In that letter, a statement was made to the effect the 65 foot height limit would be vital for the preservation of the present character of the building, the relationship to the street (in width), in appearance and in use. Mr. McComish felt that landmarks designation itself should be considered unnecessary if preservation of the area could be achieved by the 65 foot height limit; and, in any case, he felt that no single property owner should be forced to have four of their buildings designated as landmarks.

Commissioner Porter remarked that a number of property owners, some of whom own more than one building, had willingly agreed to have their buildings designated as landmarks.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if Mr. McComish's clients also owned the corner parking lot adjacent to the subject buildings. Mr. DeVelbiss, Secretary of the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board, replied in the affirmative.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Elliott, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6280 be adopted and that the Hotaling Annex, East at 445 Jackson Street be designated as a landmark.

Subsequently, it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Elliott, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6281 be adopted and that the Medico-Dental Building at 435-441 Jackson Street be designated as a landmark.

Subsequently, it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Elliott, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6282 be adopted and that the Old Ghirardelli Building at 417-419 Jackson Street be designated as a landmark.

Finally, it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Elliott, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6283 be adopted and that the Ghirardelli Annex (Regency House) at 407 Jackson Street, be designated as a landmark.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio, Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
SUMMARY AND MINUTES
OF THE
SPECIAL MEETING
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1968

PRESENT: Elliott, Fleishhacker, Kearney, Porter, Wight.

1:00 P.M.

Members of the City Planning Commission and staff departed from 100 Larkin Street for a field trip to review zoning cases scheduled for hearing on November 7, 1968. The meeting was adjourned upon return of the Commissioners and staff at 2:00 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

R. Bruce Anderson
Acting Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the special meeting held Thursday, October 31, 1968.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, October 31, 1968, at 7:30 P.M. in the auditorium of Galileo High School, 1150 Francisco Street.

PRESENT: William M. Brinton, President; Mrs. Charles B. Porter, Vice President; Virgil L. Elliott, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Jr., James S. Kearney, Walter S. Newman and Walter W. Wight, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: None.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allen B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; Dean L. Macris, Assistant Director-Plans and Programs; James Paul, Planner III; and R. Bruce Anderson, Acting Secretary. Scott Blakey represented the San Francisco Chronicle, and San Blumenfeld represented the San Francisco Examiner.

PUBLIC MEETING

President Brinton called the meeting to order at 7:40 P.M. Mr. Brinton then read an introductory statement on the purpose of this meeting. He stated that the Board of Supervisors and Mayor Alioto have requested the Planning Commission to determine the appropriate reuse of Fort Mason. The request has been prompted by the General Services Administration's interest in disposing of or reusing the property for another purpose. He further stated that this meeting has been scheduled to provide the members of the Planning Commission and the staff of the Department with an opportunity to hear public opinion and recommendations as to the possible future uses of Fort Mason, and that all individuals who have not previously had an opportunity to address the Commission regarding the possible uses of Fort Mason are invited at this time to offer their suggestions to the Commission. President Brinton concluded his statements by expressing his regret and that of his fellow Commissioners for any inconvenience which may have been caused by meeting on Halloween night; however, given the tight deadline the Commission and the Department face in submitting their report to the Board of Supervisors and the fact that other night meetings were scheduled this week, no alternative date was available.

President Brinton then opened the meeting to the floor to receive suggestions and recommendations as to the possible future uses of Fort Mason. He requested that a sheet be distributed in the audience so that persons could place their names on a register if they should wish to speak. While this sign-up sheet was being passed in the audience, President Brinton asked if anyone on the floor would like to be heard.

Steve E. Tobin, who identified himself as a taxpayer, expressed his concern over the methods for disposition of Federal property and past practices pertaining thereto by the General Services Administration. Mr. Tobin stated that Fort Mason should not be a give-away deal to some large developer.

William D. Evers, Vice-Chairman of the Bay Conversation and Development Commission, representing People for Open Space, and speaking for himself, stated that the highest and best use of Fort Mason would be the development of park and open space. Mr. Evers made the point that cities in the United States are judged by their efforts to provide parks. San Francisco is second only to New York City in the density of its population. Access to the bay is a primary concern in San Francisco; furthermore, Mr. Evers stressed that we should also consider the historical landmarks and the need for additional land for schools. He concluded his remarks by stating that the development of housing on Fort Mason would be a serious error, especially if it were luxury housing.

Vivienne Miller, a teacher at Galileo High School said that she felt surplus land at Fort Mason is needed desparately for the expansion of Galileo High School. In her opinion, it would be inexcusable to use Fort Mason for high-priced housing. She suggested that the Board of Education move to the present Galileo site, thereby making possible the vacation of the Board of Education facilities at Van Ness and Hayes Street. The Board of Education site could then be used for construction of the new Federal Office Building. Fort Mason could then be developed as a large junior and senior high school facility.

Fiorenzo Gardin, another teacher from Galileo High School, reiterated the suggestion of giving the Galileo site to the General Services Administration, so that in turn the General Services Administration could give Fort Mason to Galileo High School. Mr. Gardin stressed the over-crowded conditions at Galileo High School.

Kenneth Allen Collins, a member of the Sierra Club, but speaking for himself, recommended that the Fort Mason site be developed for park purposes and an education complex. He stated that Fort Mason represents the last piece of open space of any size in the downtown area of San Francisco, and presently it serves thousands of families. Furthermore,

future population growth will make it mandatory to keep Fort Mason for open space and to preserve its historical buildings.

John Yehall Chin, Commissioner of the Human Rights Commission of San Francisco, expressed his concern with the overcrowded conditions of Galileo High School. He stated that Galileo is presently 70% Oriental. He suggested that Fort Mason be used as an annex to Galileo High School. Given present circumstances of our urban areas, he stated that human needs come first and luxury would come thereafter. Top quality education and smaller class sizes are essential in meeting San Francisco's goal of better education for everyone.

Mrs. Hans von Briesen, a resident of the area, stated that she and her husband left Los Angeles because of that city's neglect of amenity in the urban environment. She felt that if Fort Mason were developed with high density uses that San Francisco would be following the same path Los Angeles has taken.

Mrs. Frank Hinman, President of the Russian Hill Improvement Association, expressed her concern for the Commission's observation of the existing 40-foot height limit in this area. She also felt that open space and historical buildings should be preserved.

James W. Kearney, Principal of Galileo High School, stated that the students and teachers of Galileo have been concerned with the disposition of Fort Mason for quite some time. Students and teachers over the years have submitted ideas on the possible re-uses of Fort Mason. Suggestions have included the construction of a municipal pool of an Olympian size, a community theatre, a senior citizens center, a school for adults, as well as the additional development of facilities at Fort Mason for Galileo High School. At present, Galileo gets maximum use of its facility and it is the largest high school in the city. However, the noise factor is serious. Street traffic on Van Ness and Bay Street constantly disrupt concentration and learning in student classrooms. And in the buildings at Fort Mason, which Galileo now uses on a temporary basis, the lighting and heating in these buildings are very poor. Mr. Kearney stated that the time is now for development of Fort Mason as a school facility. He stated that a school of Galileo's student enrollment and required facilities should have a campus of 40 to 60 acres. He concluded his remarks by stating that Galileo is old and outmoded as an educational facility, given the role it is to play in meeting the needs of San Francisco secondary education.

Helen French was the next speaker, belonging to the Northern California Chapter - AIA, SPUR, California Heritage Council, but speaking only for herself. Miss French emphasized that San Francisco has an enormous future, a glorious past and a fascinating present. However the population

pressures are great and are squeezing San Francisco into high-density situations. She strongly recommended that San Francisco get all of Fort Mason and that San Francisco express its gratitude to the United States Army for taking such good care of Fort Mason all these years.

Mr. David Nelson, Assistant Director of the San Francisco Maritime Museum, read a prepared statement representing the viewpoint of his organization. His statement read as follows:

"The San Francisco Maritime Museum Association, which focused the city's attention on the North Waterfront for the first time in 1949 and which brought into being the expanded museum operation in the Aquatic Park Building, secured some $2,200,000 for a Maritime State Historic Park, stabilized the area by encouraging first Ghirardelli Square and then the Cannery, has definite veiws on any future development of the Fort Mason area.

The efforts of our organization have taken some 20 years and have lead directly to the development of one of the greatest urban areas in the nation. Our organization did this work quid pro quo with a minimum of government participation of any kind.

We are proud of our record in the area, of our reputation as guardians of the North Waterfront, and are the last to say that we do not have a vested interest in not only suggesting, but indeed helping to direct future development in our area.

As conservationists we propose that as much of the Fort Mason property as possible -- especially the eastern portion which faces our lagoon -- be used strictly for park purposes.

As historians we are in support of the efforts being made to keep the area of small wooden houses constructed on the lagoon side of the Fort as an historic monument.

We further support the proposals of the three major rowing clubs in San Francisco to locate their Victorian boat houses against the bluffs of the eastern side of Fort Mason, on what presently appears to be a parking area behind a cyclone fence. This latter proposal would permit a small boat house and float to be located on the lagoon for use by all three clubs and would indeed reinvigorate rowing on the Aquatic Park Lagoon and on San Francisco Bay.

The overall thrust of our interest is to maintain the ecological and historical significance of the property and where change is to be made

make those changes for real and significant reasons, and not simply change for change's sake.

We hope that your honorable Commission will carefully consider the suggestions of our organization noting our long and continuing history in the area and tremendous success which we have been able to generate to this date."

Mrs. Frieda Klussman, President of San Francisco Beautiful, stated that as much open space should be left as possible. She stressed the importance of San Francisco dealing directly with the federal government in Washington, in order to achieve the retention of green areas in Fort Mason. People who drive down Bay Street look forward to the open area afforded by Fort Mason.

Larry Custis, a member of the audience, rose to state his opinion that the development of Fort Mason by and for the wealthy should occur so long as the poor get something out of it. For example, with the increase in available revenue realized by luxury development of the Fort Mason property, it would be possible to fund additional rent supplement programs. Or redevelopment programs could be stepped up to the benefit of lower-income families.

John Battaglia, in speaking from the audience, stated that areas like the Presidio and Fort Mason are precious in themselves and should be left exactly the way they are.

Fay Tau, a student at Galileo, emphasized that Galileo is overcrowded and that more and more immigrants send their children to this high school. She stated that 300 kids now use Fort Mason, and that if it should be taken for a use other than education, the kids will be forced to go somewhere else. She concluded her statements by saying that Galileo must have enough room to put its present students and the increased number of students it expects in the future.

Mr. Kearney then stood up and re-emphasized the severe shortage of space at Galileo. If this need for additional space is not met, he asked, what is the alternative other than double sessions. Mr. Kearney stated that forecasts show a continued addition of more and more students to Galileo's present enrollment.

Steven Lowe, a Galileo student, expressed his concern over the deteriorating conditions of the present Galileo facility, and the shortage of time students now have with their counselors. He emphasized, however, how proud the students are of their school and that the students have high

praise for the faculty. He stated that the girls and boys must share present playground facilities, where grass no longer remains. Everything is overcrowded and overused, he stated, and what Galileo really needs is a new campus.

May Tong, a student at Galileo, expressed her concern for the everyday life of the 3,000 students who attend Galileo. She stated that a new school would make life far more tolerable for these 3,000 people.

Mr. Tobin then rose from the audience and asked the Commission what the next steps would be in development of Fort Mason. President Brinton responded that the staff will make its recommendations known to the Planning Commission in a future meeting. The staff recommendations will constitute the Director's Report to the Commission. At that time the Commission can make any changes, additions or deletions to the report it wishes. After passage of the vote on the report, the report will be sent to the Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Custis then rose from his seat and stated that two interests are fighting for the acquisition of the Fort Mason property. On the one hand is the Black Power group, which is seeking to destroy existing institutions only to create new forms. On the other hand, the students of Galileo High School and the community want a school put on this site. Therefore, Mr. Custis emphasized that the development of Fort Mason site should be devoted to luxury housing so that members of impoverished areas in San Francisco might receive some benefit through an increase of tax revenues realized from development of the site.

In response to Mr. Custis' assertion, Vivienne Miller suggested that there is no way to guarantee the distribution of benefits based on Mr. Custis' plan for the development of Fort Mason.

Gini Parkley, a student, stated that Fort Mason should be kept as open space or at least it should provide Galileo with the site of a new campus. Miss Parkley emphasized that she now attends Lowell High School, where they do have a campus of sufficient size.

President Brinton explained, in response to a question from Mr. Tobin, that any perspective developer would need to build an office building downtown in exchange for some construction for whatever use on Fort Mason. Mr. Tobin then expressed his concern for preservation of national monuments now existing on the site.

Alene Somps rose to state her support for use of Fort Mason as open space. Presently it is a park area, she stated, and it should be kept that way.

Mr. Jacobs, in response to further questions raised by Mr. Tobin, explained that the Planning Commission has been asked to advise the Board of Supervisors and the Mayor as to the best possible use of Fort Mason. At the present time, he stated that there is no question of money or acquisition of the site, because the present charge of responsibility must first be settled. If the Fort Mason site is to be acquired, alternative means of acquisition might involve bond issue funding, or declaration of the Fort Mason site as surplus rather than excess property. If this latter course of action should occur, several means of financing any development would then become available. But again, Mr. Jacobs emphasized that the question now before the Commission is a determination of the best possible use of Fort Mason.

President Brinton then re-emphasized the process by which the report will be made public. First, the staff and the Director will present their findings to the Commission at a regular meeting, the date of which will be announced later. Second, once the Commission takes its action, it will be sent to the Board of Supervisors for further action, as that body may see fit.

Commissioner Kearney then stated that the Planning Commission is not presenting its opinions at this meeting, because the expressed purpose at this time is listening to the public for its best thinking. The Planning Commission will express itself when the Director and the staff make their findings known. Mr. Jacobs then stressed that the staff report will be made to the Commission.

Mr. Custis again re-emphasized how money speaks. In his opinion, the Fort Mason site should be turned over to the people who can develop it so that the poor will eventually get something. In this manner, no one loses face, especially the politicians.

Miss Allen then rose to state that the development of the Fort Mason property for whatever use must produce revenue for the city. If the land is to be used for park purposes, then the city must pay for its acquisition. Basically, money is at the bottom of this whole issue. She proposed that instead of concentrating on Fort Mason, money should be sought via federal government grants to be used for local assistance and impoverished areas of San Francisco. Local hands presently are tied by the federal government.

Hearing no further questions from the audience, President Brinton adjourned the meeting at 9:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

R. Bruce Anderson
Acting Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, November 7, 1968.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, November 7, 1968, at 2:00 p.m. in Room 282, City Hall.

PRESENT: William M. Brinton, President; Mrs. Charles B. Porter, Vice President; Virgil L. Elliott, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Jr., James S. Kearney, and Walter W. Wight, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: Walter S. Newman.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation; Wayne Rieke, Planner IV (Zoning); and R. Bruce Anderson, Acting Secretary.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of October 31, 1968 were submitted to the Planning Commission for their approval. Vice President Porter moved, and Commissioner Kearney seconded the motion, to accept the minutes of October 31, 1968, as submitted. The vote of the Commission was 5 - 0 in favor of this motion.

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, outlined proposed calendars and related subject matters likely to appear before the Commission in the coming weeks of November. Mr. Jacobs stated that on November 14 the Commission would probably hear two or three referral matters, to be followed by a staff presentation on the possible disposition of Forts Funston, Miley, and Mason properties. For the meeting of November 21, the Director informed the Commission that there would be a presentation of the Mission Street Station Plaza Area report, to be followed by a hearing on proposed changes in the Planning Code regarding tighter definitions of foster care and single-family zoning in R-1 and R-1-D areas of the City. Mr. Jacobs then reminded the Commission of the special meeting to be held jointly with the Port Authority of San Francisco on Wednesday, November 20, for a presentation of the Northern Waterfront Plan. This special meeting will be held in the chambers of the Board of Supervisors.

The Director then reported that the staff of the Department feels that a Commission resolution would be in order for a proposed rezoning of certain properties fronting on Bosworth Street. Mr. Jacobs asked Mr. Steele, the Zoning Administrator, to present this matter for consideration of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Steele stated that the Planning Commission has received an application for the reclassification of ten lots fronting on the south side of Bosworth

Street, between Chilton Avenue and Hamerton Avenue, requesting a change from R-1 (One-Family Residential) zoning to R-3 (Low-Medium Density Multiple Residential) zoning, and that contingent upon said reclassification, the Commission also has received an application for a conditional use convalescent hospital on the same property. Mr. Steele stated that both of these applications were scheduled for public hearing before the Commission on December 5, 1968. Mr. Steele explained that the subject property of these applications is completely surrounded by existing R-1 zoning, but despite the existing zoning, the applicant has submitte documentation of substantial neighborhood support for the proposed reclassification Furthermore, the widening of Bosworth Street and the impending Glen Park BARTD station near the intersection of Diamond and Bosworth Streets might make it desirable to permit a higher residential density along the south side of Bosworth Street for a number of blocks west of Diamond Street. Mr. Steele also stated that property along the north side of Bosworth Street is now vacant. Mr. Steele concluded his remarks by saying that the owners of property to be affected by this possible reclassification have not been contacted by the staff of the Department.

At this point in the proceedings Commissioner Elliott assumed his place at the Commission table.

Commissioner Fleishhacker moved, and Vice President Porter seconded the motion, to adopt the proposed resolution wherein the City Planning Commission declares its intention to initiate a change in the Use District Classification of subject properties along Bosworth Street from an R-1 and R-2 to an R-3 District, and that a public hearing would be held on the proposed change on Thursday, December 5, 1968, in Room 282, City Hall. The vote of the Commission was 6 - 0 approving this resolution.

2:00 P. M. Calendar

2. CU68.26 1949 - 23rd Street, southeast corner of Carolina Street.
Certain building alterations and ten-yard extension of 1970 expiration date.

Mr. Steele explained that the present use of the subject property is a nonconforming grocery store with a 1970 expiration date. It is on property presently zoned R-3. Mr. Koon Yic Siu, owner of the grocery store and the applicant in this case, has requested of the Commission a conditional use authorization to allow the extension of the expiration date to 1980. A building permit was recently issued to replace a portion of the floor, to install a new foundation at the rear wall, and to do other maintenance work on this nonconforming building. The applicant has stated that the continued operation of the grocery store is necessary and desirable for the convenience of the neighborhood, and that remodeling will bring the building up to required City standards. Mr. Steele also noted that the store is one block from a commercial district which includes one grocery

store, the only conforming grocery store on the south side of Potrero Hill. The subject grocery store is one of seven nonconforming grocery stores in that portion of the Potrero Hill neighborhood area which is south of 20th Street. But on the other hand, it is the only one of the seven nonconforming stores with a 1970 termination date. Mr. Steele concluded his remarks by saying that the applicant has not been in touch with the staff of the Department, but that the Potrero Boosters and Merchants Association has stated that it is not opposed to the continuance of this nonconforming use.

President Brinton asked if there were any persons in the audience who wished to be heard on this matter.

Joseph Murray, an attorney and resident of the area, stated that the premises are presently unoccupied. Mr. Murray stated that because the grocery store operation is out of business, the Commission should not grant a conditional use to set a precedent for unoccupied nonconforming uses. In response to Mr. Murray's last statement, Commissioner Elliott asked if the nonconforming use does not expire when an establishment moves out of the premises or quits business altogether. Mr. Steele answered that a three-year period is required before such a stipulation can be enforced.

Elaine Sundahl, a resident of Potrero Hill, stated that she is not in opposition to the applicant's request. She stated that the former grocer was an addition to the neighborhood and maintained clean premises. Miss Sundahl stated that she would welcome a new grocer on the site if he would have an attitude similar to that of the former grocer who had occupied this building.

Miss Gertrude Barnett rose from the audience to express her favor for allowing an extension of the expiration date to 1980 for this nonconforming use.

Mr. Steele reiterated his earlier remark that this conditional use, if granted, would authorize an extension of the nonconforming use on the subject property until 1980. He further stated that another condition of this application would be that the grocery store may not be changed to another use unless such a use would be permitted in an R-3 District, or unless the change of use is reviewed and specifically approved by the Zoning Administrator as a use which would supply retail goods or personal services that would meet the frequent and recurring needs of nearby residents.

Vice President Porter moved, and Commissioner Elliott seconded the motion, to permit the subject property as a Conditional Use in an R-3 District with an extension of the 1970 expiration date to 1980, an additional ten years. The vote of the Commission was 6 - 0 for adoption of this motion.

3. CU68.32 234 Grant Avenue and 255 and 299 Sutter Street, southeast corner of Grant Avenue and Sutter Street. Conversion of a basement to a private parking garage for approximately eighty automobiles.

Mr. Steele explained circumstances attendant to this case. He stated that the present use of this site is a former department store now being converted to individual shops on the ground floor, with a public parking garage on the upper floors. Ingress and egress to the proposed basement-area garage would be from an existing alley off of Post Street between Grant Avenue and Kearny Street. Metropolitan Parking Corporation, agent for First General Real Estate Trust, the owner of the property, proposes to use the basement of the existing building for a parking garage accommodating approximately eighty automobiles parked at monthly rates. Mr. Steele went on to state that retail stores occupy most of the buildings in the vicinity of the subject property. Many of these surrounding buildings have offices above the first floor. Additionally, there are five hotels and seven restaurants within 300 feet of the subject property. The 565-car Lick Place Garage and the 870-car Sutter-Stockton Garage are within 300 feet of the property. Also a 400-car garage has been authorized for the upper floors of the subject property.

Allan Berland, attorney for the applicant, explained that the White House structure, for the most part, is now vacant. He stated that establishment of a parking garage for monthly storage of approximately eighty automobiles in the basement of the White House structure would eliminate pressure on the upstairs parking facility caused by placement of these monthly vehicles in this latter location. Therefore, the proposed facility would leave the upstairs area for use primarily as a transient garage, serving shoppers for the various retail outlets in the area. The storage area in the basement would provide parking area for vehicles of the various businessmen and their employees of the area. The ingress/egress to the proposed facility would be from Robert Kirk Lane off Post Street.

President Brinton reminded Mr. Berland that the Planning Commission just last year had approved a 400-car garage in the upper floors of the White House structure.

Mr. Berland then submitted to the Commission a petition signed by businesses in the vicinity of the White House structure that would favor the provision of eighty parking spaces in the basement of said property. This petition is on file in the offices of the Department of City Planning, 100 Larkin Street.

Vice President Porter asked Mr. Berland why construction had been delayed on conversion of the White House structure. Mr. Berland responded that the corporation has changed hands since last year. On this basis, he stated, basement parking would be essential to the economic feasibility of the whole project.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked Mr. Berland why the applicant wishes to increase parking from 400 to 480 stalls when the access to these additional eighty stalls would be off Post Street rather than off Sutter Street, the access point for the 400 spaces on the upper floors. Mr. Berland stated that the previous proposal was for a restaurant in the basement of this structure, but that proposal fell through. This proposal, which would use the basement for parking of eighty

cars, would be a temporary use. Mr. Berland further stated that trucks now servicing local shops from Robert Kirk Lane would be provided for in the loading area inside the building, so that Robert Kirk Lane would be kept free.

President Brinton asked for the Director's recommendations. Mr. Jacobs stated that the White House proposal for a 400-car garage was granted a year ago with some misgivings. Additionally, congestion in this area remains high, and the Bureau of Traffic Engineering, Department of Public Works, is opposed to this proposal. Mr. Jacobs also stated that a light-and-bell warning system most probably would be necessary.

Mr. Berland stated that one-way circulation could be imposed on traffic movement on Robert Kirk Lane if necessary. Delivery vehicles would be handled within the building, and certainly a light-and-bell warning system would be feasible Mr. Berland then listed the tenants expected for occupancy in the White House structure, and stated in conclusion that the basement would be critical to completion of the White House project.

President Brinton stated that the Planning Commission was told the tenants would need parking if leases were to be executed, and therefore the Commission had approved a year ago the proposal for 400 parking spaces. Now, President Brinton added, eighty more spaces are requested.

Vice President Porter stated that she had misgivings about the whole project last year, and continues to have them with this project proposal. She could see the financial advantage in this proposal, but she could not see any benefit to parkers in the area.

Mr. Berland stated that financing sources have required this additional parking in order to execute the financial agreement. The White House Center Corporation had different terms for its financial resources than the present owner and applicant.

Milton Circon, real estate agent, stated that he had contacted establishments large and small in the area and all of them strongly favor this proposal. Commissioner Fleishhacker questioned whether an alternative use could not be developed in order to meet the financial requirement of the lending institution. Mr. Berland responded that such alternative uses as have been considered did not seem feasible at this time. At this point, the architect for the project, Mr. Slate, explained that means of access to the 400-car garage and committed tenant space on the ground floor would prohibit means of access to the basement from areas other than the Robert Kirk Lane source.

Paul Ansen, president of the Metropolitan Parking Corporation, stated that he would prefer not to have parking in the basement if optimum conditions were to prevail. He stressed that unloading services for buildings to the east and west sides of Robert Kirk Lane would be provided. The major aim of this proposal, Mr. Ansen stated, was to relieve parking conditions for "short-termers" while taking care of the "monthlies" in the basement.

President Brinton asked if conversion costs for a basement garage would not be a major investment. Mr. Berland replied that indeed the conversion costs would be high, but they are necessary to execute financial arrangements for the whole project. Mr. Brinton then stated that he would approve the conditional use of this proposal with a one-year termination date.

President Brinton called for the Director's recommendation. Mr. Jacobs recommended disapproval of the subject application, stating that the only access to this proposed basement would be by way of a one-way alley, namely, Robert Kirk Lane, which is already used by trucks servicing individual stores in the subject building. Additionally, during peak hours, downtown traffic congestion would be compounded by use of this alley for a garage entrance and exit.

Commissioner Kearney moved, and Commissioner Fleishhacker seconded the motion, to adopt the Director's recommendation for disapproval of the subject application.

Commissioner Kearney asked to go on record stating that public interest comes first, and that the Bureau of Traffic Engineering, Department of Public Works, issued a report which substantiates the Director's report and recommendations. President Brinton called for the vote, and the Commission voted 5 - 1 to accept the Director's recommendation. The one dissenting vote was cast by President Brinton.

4. CU68.33 707 - 719 Sacramento Street and 549 - 567 Kearny Street, southwest corner of Kearny and Sacramento Street. Parking lot to be converted later to parking garage for approximately 200 automobiles.

Mr. Steele described the subject property at 707 - 719 Sacramento Street and 549 - 567 Kearny Street as a generally rectangular parcel with a frontage of 160 feet on Kearny Street and 131 feet on Sacramento Street, having a total land area of 18,302 square feet and zoned C-3-0 and C-3-G. Mr. Steele explained that existing commercial buildings on the northern portion of the subject site currently are being raised. The southern portion of the property is currently used as a parking lot for 67 cars. The proposal of the applicant, H. J. Degenkolb and Associates, is to first use the entire site as a parking lot; however, as soon as working drawings can be completed and a building permit can be obtained, then the applicant wishes to construct a three-level parking garage occupying the entire site. This garage, when completed, would provide parking for approximately 200 automobiles. Furthermore, the project is considered by the applicant as an interim development with a life span of five to fifteen years.

Mr. Steele stated that a number of large office buildings are in the immediate vicinity, such as the Hartford Building, the new Bank of America building, the International Building, the Pacific Mutual Life Insurance building, the Home Insurance Company building, and the United California Bank building. Much of the property north of Sacramento Street is occupied by uses related to the

Chinatown district, such as stores, restaurants, garment factories, launderies, food factories, and small hotels and rooming houses. St. Mary's Garage with a capacity of 860 cars is the only large, public garage within 300 feet. The subject proposal is one-half block inside the peripheral parking-zone boundary as outlined in the Downtown Zoning Study.

Commissioner Fleishhacker inquired about the location of entrances and exits to this parking lot. Mr. Steele responded that the main entrance and exit would be located on Sacramento Street, principally to serve night business from restaurants to the east. Additionally, the facility would have a reservoir aisle space which could accommodate approximately twenty automobiles.

Henry Degenkolb, speaking for the applicants, stated that the four old buildings now on the site are unsafe and must be torn down. Therefore, as stated previously, the parking lot would be an interim use until the parking garage could be constructed.

President Brinton requested that Mr. Steele give the staff recommendation on the subject application. Mr. Steele stated that the staff recommends approval of the proposed parking lot and, at a later point, the parking garage. The location is appropriate for a parking facility being accessible from the northeast and west without the necessity of traveling through the congested area, and yet being conveniently located in areas of highest demand. The plans for the parking lot and garage submitted by the applicant were not sufficiently complete to approve at this hearing, and it therefore will be necessary that final plans be approved by the Department's staff before the subject property can be used for a parking lot or a garage.

President Brinton asked the applicant, Mr. Degenkolb, if he had any questions before the Commission considered the proposed resolution. Mr. Degenkolb responded that he questioned the screening and planting required for construction of the building, and in this light, he inquired whether the preliminary drawings are acceptable to the staff and the Commission. Mr. Steele responded that the preliminary drawings are acceptable at this point, but final drawings would be subject to further review as stated in the proposed resolution.

Vice President Porter moved, and Commissioner Kearney seconded the motion to accept the Director's recommendation for approval of the subject application. The vote of the Commission was unanimous, 6 - 0, in favor of the Director's recommendation.

2:30 P. M. Calendar

5. CU68.28 2198 Fell Street, northeast corner of Fell and Stanyan Streets. Demolish existing structure and reconstruct an automobile service station, presently a nonconforming use.

Mr. Steele stated that the subject property at 2198 Fell Street is presently a nonconforming automobile service station, built in 1937 and having an expiration date of 1980. The present zoning of this property is R-5. The applicant proposes, by conditional use, to replace the existing service station building with a building of greater lot coverage than that of the existing building. More specifically, the applicant has stated that he wishes to replace the obsolete service station with "modern rustic facilities" which will contribute to the appearance of the area, improve property values, and increase the property tax base. The subject property on Stanyan Street faces Golden Gate Park and the Park Panhandle. Fell Street is occupied by high-medium density apartment buildings east of the subject site, and along Stanyan Street north of the subject site are one two-family dwelling and two single-family dwellings; at the southeast corner of Stanyan Street and Haight Street is a 36-unit apartment building.

Rex Dalrymple, attorney for Shell Oil Company, explained that a Shell Station has been at this location since 1937. Shell wishes to upgrade this station as part of its City-wide program. The north and east sides of the subject property would be fully landscaped, and Fell and Stanyan would have double-line tree planting. The architecture of the new building would be of the French mansard style. Lighting of the structure would be soft and pointed downward. With its central location, the station would serve both citizens and visitors of San Francisco. Mr. Dalrymple stressed that only two signs are included in the proposal.

President Brinton called for the staff recommendation. Mr. Steele recommended approval of the subject application, stating that the service station building at this corner needs rebuilding both to provide better service and to improve its appearance. If it is rebuilt in accordance with submitted plans and the conditions of the proposed resolution, the service station would be more visually compatible with facing City parks and will not be detrimental to residential property in the neighborhood. Furthermore, one condition of the proposed resolution assures that the 1980 expiration date for nonconforming uses on the subject property will continue in its effect. Mr. Steele concluded by stating that the proposed conditions have been explained and are acceptable to the Shell Oil Company.

Vice President Porter moved, and Commissioner Elliott seconded the motion, to accept the staff recommendation for approval of the subject application. The vote of the Commission was unanimous, 6 - 0, in adoption of the resolution.

6. CU68.29 1200 Clayton Street, southeast corner of Clayton and 17th Street.
Add trash enclosure and pump island canopy to an automobile service station, presently a nonconforming use.

Mr. Steele reported that the City Planning Commission received a letter dated November 5, 1968, from the Shell Oil Company, applicant in this case, requesting a withdrawal without prejudice of said application.

Vice President Porter moved, and Commissioner Fleishhacker seconded the motion, that the City Planning Commission grant said request for withdrawal without prejudice of Shell Oil Company's application CU68.29. The favorable vote of the Commission was unanimous.

7. ZM68.22 1064 - 1066 Oak Street.
R-4 to a C-2 District.

Mr. Steele explained that the subject property, 1064 - 1066 Oak Street, has a present use as a two-family dwelling and that the present zoning of the subject property is R-4. The Shell Oil Company, applicant in this case, has asked for a zone reclassification from R-4 to C-2 in order to extend the egress driveway of the adjoining gasoline station and for the eventual redevelopment of the station site. Mr. Steele explained that the applicant has stated that the traffic hazard will be reduced by extending the driveway and demolishing the existing structure. Current plans call for demolition of the existing two-family dwelling and pavement for parking, but eventually the Shell Oil Company plans to reconstruct the service station building using the additional property. Present zoning of the surrounding land use shows Oak Street classified R-4 and developed residentially except for a nonconforming store, storage and offices adjacent to the subject property. Divisadero Street, classified commercial, is developed commercially.

Mr. Dalrymple, representing the Shell Oil Company, stated that this is another site as part of Shell's long-range program for San Francisco in upgrading the appearance and service capacity of its service stations. The long-range program with Shell also provides employment and a payroll presently in excess of $60,000 per year for so-called hard core unemployable individuals. The existing volume of 10,000 customers serviced monthly will double by 1980, in Mr. Dalrymple's opinion. Additional property is simply not available today, so that Shell is forced to expand and upgrade its service stations on present property at present locations rather than to acquire new locations.

President Brinton called for the staff recommendation. Mr. Steele stated that he would recommend approval of the subject application, in that increasing the Oak Street frontage of this service station to 150 feet would improve ingress and egress for the service station to the general benefit of the public, and also would permit the operator to rebuild at a future time with an assurance of adequate frontage for efficient service. Mr. Steele assured the Commission that this application would not allow for a new use nor would it imply an extension of any commercial use in the area. Mr. Steele stated that a billboard is now on the site and that he would like to see it removed, but it is allowed in the C-2 district. Mr. Dalrymple responded that Shell Oil Company would remove this billboard if the City should desire to have it removed.

President Brinton called for the pleasure of the Commission. Commissioner Fleishhacker moved, and Vice President Porter seconded the motion, to accept the Director's recommendation for approval of the subject application. The vote of the Commission was unanimous, 6 - 0.

8. ZM68.23 601 Lincoln Way and 1219 - 1221 Seventh Avenue, southwest corner of seventh Avenue and Lincoln Way. R-4 to a C-2 district.

Mr. Steele explained that the subject property located at 601 Lincoln Way and 1219 - 1221 Seventh Avenue is presently occupied by a nonconforming automobile service station having an expiration date of 1985, and by a parking area to the south of the station that was permitted as a conditional use in 1961. Mr. Steele explained that the Shell Oil Company wishes to reclassify Lots 3 and 50 in Assessor's Block 1743 to a C-2 classification. Furthermore, he stated, the applicant intends to demolish the existing structure to construct a landscaped four-bay three pump island service station primarily oriented to Seventh Avenue.

Mr. Dalrymple, representing Shell Oil Company, rose from the audience and asked that the Commission allow for an extension of this case for sixty days, in order to discuss the case further with staff of the Department.

Commissioner Kearney moved, and Vice President Porter seconded the motion, to accept Mr. Dalrymple's request for a postponement of ZM68.23 until the Commission's regular meeting of January 9, 1969, at 3:00 p.m.

<u>3:00 P. M. Calendar</u>

9. ZM68.20 2 Castro Street, southwest corner of Duboce Avenue and Castro Street. R-3 to an R-4 District.

10. CU68.23 2 Castro Street, southwest corner of Duboce Avenue and Castro Street. Conversion of ground floor to medical offices.

Mr. Steele stated that the City Planning Commission had received a letter dated November 7, 1968, from Jack K. Dooling, attorney for Eugene M. Harding, applicant in ZM68.20 and CU68.23, requesting withdrawal without prejudice of the above two applications.

Commissioner Kearney moved, and Vice President Porter seconded the motion, to accept Mr. Dooling's request that the subject applications mentioned above be withdrawn without prejudice at this time. President Brinton called for the vote of the Commission. The vote was unanimous in favor of Mr. Kearney's motion.

At this point in the meeting, President Brinton called for a recess of the Commission until 4:00 P.M., at which time the next item would be heard on the Commission's agenda.

4:00 P.M. Calendar

11. ZM68.29 1030 Crescent Avenue, Sun Valley Dairy and Farmers Market.
C-2 and R-1 to a C-M District.

Vice President Porter called the meeting back to order at 4:00 P.M., as President Brinton had been detained. She asked Mr. Steele to outline the circumstances of this case.

Mr. Steele explained that the subject property, Sun Valley Dairy, comprised an area of 5.4 acres with many owners involved. Mr. Steele stated that the present Sun Valley Dairy Building at 300 Alemany Boulevard and four lots on the west side of Prentiss Street, occupied by a single-family dwelling at 1030 Crescent Avenue, are owned by the Sun Valley Dairy, and that parking areas presently used by Sun Valley Dairy adjacent to the east of the Dairy and across Crescent Avenue are leased from the City Water Department. Furthermore, the Farmers Market is on City-owned land under the jurisdiction of the Agriculture Department, and the vacant lot at the northeast corner of Crescent Avenue and Nevada Street is owned by Dominique Dapaoli. The proposed reclassification was initiated by the City Planning Commission at its meeting of October 3, 1968, under Resolution No. 6270. The present proposal to reclassify the subject property to a C-M District would permit the City Planning Commission to consider expansion of the Sun Valley Dairy products distribution plant as a conditional use, and to cause the open land use nature of the Farmers Market to be in conformity with the regulations of the Planning Code. In summary, Mr. Steele explained that reclassification would make the present Sun Valley Dairy a conditional use, with former stipulations (1957, 1958) to remain in effect and expansion to be permitted only through conditional use approval. The Farmers Market is presently a conforming retail use, but does not meet the standards for enclosure in a C-2 District. If reclassified, then additional uses could be permitted at the Farmers Market such as a storage warehouse and live storage, killing or dressing of rabbits or poultry.

Vice President Porter asked Mr. Steele to explain the relationship of Sun Valley Dairy's request for reclassification to the whole area and its rezoning. Mr. Steele answered that the staff was opposed to Sun Valley's request for reclassification unless the whole area was rezoned.

At this point in the meeting, President Brinton returned and assumed his place at the Commission table.

Harry Bloom, representing the Sun Valley Dairy Company, explained that the Dairy wants to build an ice cream plant involving an auxiliary building and parking space for seven trucks. Access to this ice cream plant and storage space would be from Prentiss Street.

Charles Rawcliff, a homeowner, wished to question the validity of a "breakthrough" into the area with this proposal for C-M zoning. Vice President Porter reassured Mr. Rawcliff that the procedures of conditional use must be followed and the Commission is quite sympathetic to protection of homeowners and residential land use.

Mr. Ben Teshara, owner of Sun Valley Dairy, told the Commission that for a good many years, at the least, that there are no plans in the hopper for high-rise construction on this site. In response to this comment, Mr. Rawcliff then questioned what guarantee exists in preventing high-rise construction should this application be granted. Mr. Jacobs stated that conditions must be met under conditional use provisions. In this case the applicant, Sun Valley Dairy, has filed plans and has understood conditions to be met should the application be approved by the Commission.

Frank Renstrom, a member of the audience, rose to state that this change, if approved, would guarantee the Commission the right to review of any new use to be proposed on the site.

Mrs. Sun, who stated that she lived one block from the Dairy, wished to question the type of motor vehicles to be used at this site. In response, Mr. Bloom stated that no additional vehicles would be necessary and that existing trucks would be handled in an off-street bay. Off-street loading, Mr. Bloom stated, is the change which expansion would allow for. However, Mrs. Sun questioned the noise factor and safety elements of trucks going in and out of the Dairy yard.

Miss Anne Farrar, who gave her address as 216 Filbert Street, stated that she was representing P.E.O. and that the position of her organization was that the petition for rezoning should be denied. She felt that if any of the present uses should change, then perhaps other, more injurious uses could come into the area under C-M zoning. Miss Farrar also suggested that poultry dressing could occur at the Farmers Market, but in response Commissioner Elliott stated that poultry dressing is not now possible at the Farmers Market. At this point in the proceedings, Mrs. Porter questioned Miss Farrar as to the number of people in P.E.O. Miss Farrar did not respond directly, stating instead that her organization represents groups and people all over San Francisco.

Miss Farrar stated that the noise factor in this area is severe, and rather than allow for its continuation, that this area should be an entrance to the greater residential area of this part of the City. Miss Farrar also suggested that the Commission might feel obligated to the Dairy because it had granted the

Dairy an original conditional use permit. Therefore, she wished to remind the Commission that the operation of the Sun Valley Dairy is now considerably larger. She also stated that the Sun Valley Dairy might be violating the sign ordinance for this area, but that in either case, the Commission should feel that its first obligation is to the neighborhood. At this point in the proceedings, Vice President Porter reminded Miss Farrar to keep her arguments to the specifics of the subject application.

In returning to her presentation, Miss Farrar stated that an implicit assumption has been made that the Sun Valley Dairy needs to stay in San Francisco because of the "usual planning talk of jobs and city obligation to its industries". In summary, Miss Farrar felt that the neighborhood area should come first, and therefore urged strongly the denial of the subject application.

Mr. Steele reiterated why the Planning Commission wishes to recommend a change in present zoning. He stated that the Sun Valley Dairy would be less detrimental to the neighborhood if the improvements, as proposed, could be made to the Dairy premises. However, at this point, Mrs. Sun questioned if taxes would not go up in the neighboring areas, because of these improvements and the change of zoning. Mr. Steele responded that taxes probably would not increase, but on this point only the Assessor could say.

Alvin Wong, a property owner across the street from Sun Valley Dairy, questioned why expansion could not conceivably go skyward if it is allowed to expand horizontally. Mr. Bloom rose to say that the Dairy is expanding horizontally as an indication of it not going upward. At this point, Mr. Jacobs stated that past Commissions and the present Commission have a record of preserving views, and in this light, if the Dairy should come back for a higher building, the Commission would take a very close look at any such proposal.

Mrs. Porter explained that Sun Valley Dairy is obviously bringing its best and only proposal before the Planning Commission. Anything can happen in the future, but at the present, Sun Valley Dairy must stand by the conditions outlined in the conditional use application and the proposed resolution.

President Brinton called for the staff recommendation. Mr. Steele recommended approval of the proposed reclassification, stating that the Dairy and the Farmers Market are acceptable uses in the area and that this reclassification would make them conforming uses. It would also permit the Commission to approve the expansion of Sun Valley Dairy, so long as operations are conducted completely within an enclosed building. Commissioner Elliott moved, and Commissioner Kearney seconded the motion, to accept the Director's recommendation for approval of ZM68.29. The vote of the Commission was unanimous, 6 - 0, in favor of Mr. Elliott's motion.

In accordance with a staff recommendation and by agreement with the applicant, Sun Valley Dairy, it was moved by Commissioner Elliott and the motion

seconded by Commissioner Kearney to withdraw ZM68.17 (1030 Crescent Avenue, Sun Valley Dairy and Farmers Market; C-2 to an M-1 District). The vote of the Commission to withdraw ZM68.17 was unanimous, 6 - 0.

12. CU68.34 Sun Valley Dairy, 300 Alemany Boulevard and 1030 Crescent Avenue.
Expansion of dairy products distribution plant.

Mr. Steele told the Commission that the applicant, Sun Valley Dairy, proposes to expand the dairy products distribution plant contingent upon the above reclassification as set forth in ZM68.29. The applicant's plot plan shows construction of a freezer and a "freezer anteroom" for storage of frozen dairy products, together with docks for the unloading of trucks directly into the freezer, and for the loading of delivery trucks directly from the anteroom. The plot plan also shows off-street parking spaces for seven vehicles behind a twelve-foot wall on the perimeter of the four lots and vacated street. The wall would be set back three feet from Crescent Avenue to allow for planting; street trees are proposed for the Crescent Avenue frontage of the Dairy. A 20-foot wide driveway would be provided from Crescent Avenue immediately west of the existing building.

Mr. Steele recommended approval of this proposal. He stated that the relationship of the Sun Valley Dairy to the adjacent residential area makes it appropriate and desirable to screen the service operation of the Dairy from nearby dwelling units. The applicant's plan includes screening and landscaping of the site. These changes should improve both the efficiency and the appearance of plant operation. Such changes would also include improvements on City-owned property currently being leased as a parking lot for the Dairy. He further stated that the subject applicant, Sun Valley Dairy, had agreed to the conditions as set forth in the proposed resolution now before the Commission.

Commissioner Elliott moved, and Commissioner Kearney seconded the motion, to accept the staff recommendation for approval, with conditions, of CU68.34. The vote of the Commission was unanimous, 6 - 0, in adopting the staff recommendation.

13. R67.62 Vacation of Prentiss Street between Carson Avenue and Alemany Boulevard.
(Under advisement from meeting of October 5, 1967.)

Mr. Steele explained that the purpose of this street vacation is to allow for expansion of the Sun Valley Dairy products distribution plant, and to use the vacated property for outdoor storage facilities. Since the owners of the Sun Valley Dairy have submitted their plans for expansion, applied for the appropriate rezoning, and because the Commission has just acted favorably on the rezoning request as outlined above in ZM68.29, Mr. Steele recommended that the Director be authorized to report that the proposed vacation of Prentiss Street

between Crescent Avenue and Alemany Boulevard be found in conformity with the Master Plan with conditions.

Vice President Porter moved, and Commissioner Fleishhacker seconded the motion, to accept the Director's recommendation for the vacation of Prentiss Street between Crescent Avenue and Alemany Boulevard. The vote of the Commission was unanimous, 6 - 0, in support of this recommendation.

4:30 P.M. Calendar

14. CU68.27 2170 Hayes Street.
Convert basement and garage of existing dwelling to medical offices.

Mr. Steele described the subject property at 2170 Hayes Street as a rectangular parcel having a width of 25 feet, a depth of 100 feet, and therefore a total land area of 2,500 square feet. He stated that the present use is a vacant single-family dwelling unit with two floors over a basement garage, whose present zoning is R-4. The proposal of the applicant, Mr. Theodore Weiman is to remodel the existing basement garage to accommodate approximately 900 square feet of medical office space. In the proposal, the two floors of the dwelling are shown as unoccupied. Furthermore, in addition to the proposed basement alterations, the building plans indicate the addition of new structural members to the floors and walls of the building. The applicant feels that the proposed change is desirable because it is in the area of St. Mary's Hospital. The present neighborhood is zoned residentially, but includes conditional use medical facilities at St. Mary's Hospital as well as nonconforming commercial uses on the corner of Hayes and Cole Streets. Otherwise the area is developed with primarily multi-family dwellings. Finally, the petitioner appeared before the Commission in 1963 to request authorization for expansion of the parking lot to the rear of his clinic, but the Commission refused to grant such authorization.

Harold Engle, a civil engineer and representing the applicant, stated that the subject application should be considered on the merits of the proposal alone and not in conjunction with an existing, neighboring building. Mr. Engle stated that the staff of the Department has considered the whole complex in the past; Mr. Engle mentioned that he did not feel this was fair to the interests of his client.

Mr. Steele stated that the staff recommendation calls for disapproval of this conditional use request, namely, the conversion to medical offices of the basement and garage of the dwelling at 2170 Hayes Street. Mr. Steele stated that the Code does not permit approval of such a conditional use without provision of required parking, and the applicant's proposal does not provide sufficient parking. In response to Mr. Engle's point concerning consideration of the subject proposal on its merits alone and not in conjunction with an existing building, Mr. Steele stated that the whole complex should be considered at once since there

is one management governing the complex. In response to Mr. Steele's reporting of the staff recommendation, Mr. Engle stated that the owner needs to straighten out his parking problems before further construction can occur, and therefore would ask the Commission to consider the subject proposal in this light.

Commissioner Wight moved, and Commissioner Elliott seconded the motion, to adopt the Director's recommendation for disapproval of the conditional use request. The vote of the Commission was unanimous, 6 - 0, in favor of the Director's recommendation.

15. ZM68.27 North side of Palou Avenue, 175 feet northwest of Rankin Street.
R-1 to M-1 District.

Mr. Steele described the subject property on Palou Avenue, north side, 175 feet west of Rankin Street, as a rectangular parcel extending 125 feet along Palou Avenue for a depth of 100 feet. The present zoning of the subject property is R-1. The present use of this site includes the western 50 feet as parking for automobiles and trucks of Arden Farms Dairy, and the eastern 75 feet as vacant. The applicant in this case, Mr. and Mrs. Al Andrade, owners of the eastern 75 feet of the parcel, wish to reclassify the subject property from R-1 to M-1 (Light Industrial) in order to construct a new building for warehousing and light manufacturing on this eastern 75 feet of the parcel. The applicant's statement read in part: "The subject property is bounded on the west by light industrial (M-1) property and on the north by commercial-industrial property (C-M) thereby creating a hesitance on the part of individuals to construct new single-family residences. It would be to the general welfare to improve this site with a large industrial building constructed with modern architecture techniques adding to the aesthetics of the area."

Mr. Steele pointed out to the Commission that half of the block in which the subject property is located is zoned M-1. One quarter is C-M, and the remaining quarter is R-1. The M-1 area is occupied entirely by a dairy products plant, which also uses two 25-foot wide lots in the C-M district and two similar lots in the R-1 district for parking. Although the Dairy has an entrance on Palou, its industrial activity is oriented mainly to Oakdale and Selby Streets. A C-M strip 100 feet deep extends approximately 1,500 feet along the south line of Oakdale and contains some industrial buildings. But deteriorated dwellings and dwellings that have been either wholly or partially converted to industrial use predominate along this strip, and except for the subject property, the R-1 portion of this block and the property directly across Palou in an R-1 district are occupied by well-maintained single-family dwellings. Many of these dwellings have been built or moved into the area within the past twenty years. This residential district extends south and east of the subject property. The southern freeway, on an elevated structure over Selby Street, forms the western boundary of the R-1 district.

President Brinton asked if anyone in the audience wished to be heard on this matter.

Mr. Polsky, a real estate agent, stated that he was at the hearing to represent his client, the subject applicant. Mr. Polsky explained that the subject property would be used for light industrial and office use only. Mr. Polsky assured the Commission that there would be no dumping of debris on the subject parcel, should the Commission allow for the proposed zoning change and subsequent development.

Mrs. Stancel, a resident of the area, stated that this area is primarily a residential area, and one not appropriate for the intrusion of business. Mrs. Stancel presented to the Commission a petition in support of her position.

Mr. March, another resident of the area, stated his concern for children in the neighborhood and the uses to which the subject area might be put. He asked the Commission to deny this request for rezoning in order to save the neighborhood for children and homes. Furthermore, Mr. March stated, the traffic congestion is bad enough as it is.

Mrs. Gibson, a resident of the area, stated that her main concern was the heavy amount of traffic and noise along Palou. She asked the Commission to be aware of the bad traffic situation in considering a possible rezoning of this parcel.

Mrs. Wilkins, who stated that she lives across the street from the area proposed for rezoning, advised the Commission that Palou is as bad as Oakdale in the morning, in terms of traffic volume, because of the Naval Shipyard. Mrs. Wilkins stated that parking is already tough enough to find in the area. She and other residents in the area are most interested in maintaining and further improving the residential values of the neighborhood.

Mr. Lewis Rand rose to state his objection to the existing traffic and warehousing activity in the neighborhood, and asked the Commission rhetorically if they should add to it by granting this zoning change.

Mrs. Jefferson, who has lived in the area for nineteen years, stated that she has fought for eighteen years to get housing on the lots proposed for rezoning. Mrs. Jefferson stated that if housing cannot be built on this parcel, she still would not like to see it rezoned to industrial use.

President Brinton called for the staff recommendation. Mr. Steele stated that the staff recommends disapproval of the proposed reclassification to M-1. He stated that Palou Street is residentially developed and should remain a residential street. He indicated that homes on Palou Street are well-maintained and are a manifestation of a stable and desirable neighborhood. Furthermore, the only industrial intrusion which has been permitted is on Oakdale Street, which is

an industrial street, and that this intrusion was only permitted subject to stipulations to protect the residential neighborhood. At this point in the proceedings, Mr. Jacobs explained to the Commission that members of the South Bayshore study team had visited the site and were party to the decision to recommend against the proposed rezoning.

Commissioner Kearney moved, and Commissioner Wight seconded the motion, to accept the Director's recommendation for disapproval of the proposed reclassification. The vote of the Commission was unanimous, 6 - 0, in support of the Director's recommendation.

Hearing no further questions or matters brought to the Commission's attention, President Brinton adjourned the meeting at 5:30 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

R. Bruce Anderson
Acting Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, November 14, 1968.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, November 14, 1968, at 2:15 p.m. in the meeting room at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: William M. Brinton, President; Mrs. Charles B. Porter, Vice President; Virgil L. Elliott, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Jr., James S. Kearney, Walter S. Newman, and Walter W. Wight, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: None.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director-Operations; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation; Samuel Jung, Planner IV; Wayne Rieke, Planner IV (Zoning); and R. Bruce Anderson, Acting Secretary.

Scott Blakey represented the San Francisco Chronicle; Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner.

CURRENT MATTERS

The Director reported that Mr. Orris Willard, a former member of the Planning Commission, will present a special report to the Commission at its regular meeting on December 12 pursuant to the work of Mr. Willard and others on a ferry boat feasibility study. Mr. Jacobs also wished to remind the Commission of the special meeting scheduled for the following Wednesday, November 20, at 2:30 p.m., in the chambers of the Board of Supervisors, at which time there would be a presentation of the Northern Waterfront Plan.

The Director asked the Secretary to distribute a draft resolution for consideration of the Commission. Mr. Jacobs stated that this resolution, if adopted, would authorize the Director of Planning to enter into and sign an agreement with David Bradwell and Associates, economic consultants, for the purpose of conducting a survey of the housing market. He stated that this information is necessary for preparation of the housing element of the Master Plan.

President Brinton then asked the Director what the Department would gain over what the Department already has in the way of housing inventory information. Mr. Jacobs read selected parts of the intended scope of services to be covered by the proposed contract, citing specific types of information to be acquired, such as vacancy rates, market conditions of rental properties, distribution of households by housing type, and physical conditions of the housing stock of San Francisco. He also stated that this survey would be compatible with, and would complement, past housing inventories and studies.

President Brinton then queried Mr. Jacobs as to the completion date of this contract. Mr. Jacobs responded that the projected completion date would be April, 1969.

Commissioner Fleishhacker then asked for a brief sketch of David Bradwell's background. Mr. Jacobs stated that Mr. Bradwell and his associates are identified primarily with this type of work, and that their reputation in this field is quite good. Commissioner Newman then asked how much this survey would cost. Mr. Jacobs stated that the cost would be in the range of $15,000 - $19,000.

Commissioner Newman moved, and Commissioner Elliott seconded the motion, for adoption of the draft resolution, that the City Planning Commission would hereby authorize the Director of Planning to enter into and sign an agreement with David Bradwell and Associates, Economic Consultants, to undertake a survey of the housing market to provide current information which would be of use in preparation of the housing element of the Master Plan. The Commission's vote was unanimous, 6-0.

Mr. Jacobs then introduced Jack Barron, project manager of the Transit Task Force, and William Hull of the Joint Venture staff, who have come before the Commission today to present a status report on planning and design for the Civic Center Station plaza. Mr. Jacobs asked Mr. Barron to begin the presentation. Mr. Barron stated that the Transit Task Force and Joint Venture staff have been charged with producing schematic designs and an implementation program for the reconstruction of Market Street. More specifically, some time ago the Board of Supervisors requested the Transit Task Force to restudy the Civic Center Station plaza area. Therefore, this presentation, Mr. Barron noted, would focus on two alternative schemes for reconstruction of the Civic Center Station plaza area once BART construction is completed.

Mr. William Hull began a slide presentation on the study of these two alternative sites, namely, either an extension of the plaza south from the corner of Seventh and Market Streets, or a plaza extension on the south side of Market, mid-block between Seventh and Eighth Streets. During his slide presentation, Mr. Hull explained that Market Street as a ceremonial way splits off at the Civic Center Station plaza area to extend up Fulton Street toward City Hall. At present a large sculptural element on the north side of Market Street is planned for the plaza area. A mid-block plaza on the south side at mid-block would relate directly to the north side plaza area, whereas an extension south at Seventh Street would establish tension between the two plaza areas and would distract attention from the linearity of Market Street. Mr. Hull also explained that accessibility to land uses south of Market favors the mid-block extension, rather than at the corner of Seventh Street.

Mr. Hull emphasized that one key advantage of the mid-block plaza extension would be the possibility of encouraging mid-block development, as well as the separation of pedestrians from vehicular traffic. This mid-block

plaza extension would also facilitate the transfer of patrons between BART, Muni, and Greyhound, and cause less disruption of traffic. Mr. Hull concluded his presentation by stating that land acquisition for a plaza at the corner of Seventh and Market Streets would cost $1,000,000 more than the cost of land acquisition for a mid-block plaza extension.

Mr. Jacobs commented that the Seventh Street corner plaza extension looks at first glance to be the obvious choice, but this is not necessarily so. Factors of cost, accessibility to the mezzanine areas, and the facade along Market Street favor development of the mid-block plaza extension. Commissioner Kearney then asked why the Supervisors were interested in a restudy of these alternative sites. Mr. Jacobs responded that the Supervisors were interested in a restudy of these sites due to an alternative proposal presented by consultants working on the mezzanine extension below Market Street, under a contract different than the one for beautification of the surface of Market Street.

2:30 Calendar

Consideration of the proposal to designate the Colonial Dames (McElroy) Octagon House as an historical landmark.

Mr. Steele explained that the Colonial Dames (McElroy) Octagon House is one of San Francisco's two remaining octagonal houses built for William C. McElroy in 1861, based on a "new and rational plan" for dwellings according to a style made popular in the United States by Orson Squire Fowler. Furthermore, this house was a gathering place of artists, writers, and others during the residence of Daniel O'Connell, well-known local poet. The Octagon House was saved from destruction by the Colonial Dames Resident in the State of California and restored and put into service as a museum for eighteenth century antiques. The Octagon House is listed in the Historic American Building Survey of the National Park Service of the United States.

Mr. Steele described the Octagon House as a two-story structure with walls of concrete construction covered with clapboards, where the eight-sided walls are capped by an eight-sided cupola in the classical style of architecture influenced by Italianate. Furthermore, the house has a steep shingled roof with projecting eaves and a little porch with a recessed entrance. Mr. Steele concluded his presentation by recommending that the City Planning Commission designate the Colonial Dames (McElroy) Octagon House as a landmark pursuant to Article 10 of the Planning Code.

Mrs. Peter Platt, a member of the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board, stated that a request for this building to be designated as an historical landmark came directly from the Colonial Dames. President Brinton acknowledged a letter he had received from the Colonial Dames, addressed to the Commission on this subject.

Commissioner Newman moved, and Commissioner Fleishhacker seconded the motion, that the City Planning Commission designate the Colonial Dames (McElroy) Octagon House as a landmark pursuant to Article 10 of the Planning Code, and that the Commission hereby direct the Secretary to transmit the proposal for designation, with a copy of this Resolution, to the Board of Supervisors for appropriate action. The vote of the Commission was 6 - 0.

REFERRALS

R68.64 Beale Street, east side, Market Street to 290 feet southerly, change in official sidewalk width from 10 feet to 14.5 feet.

Mr. Jung explained that a request for widening of this sidewalk has come from the Pacific Gas and Electric Company, which desires to enhance its existing building with street trees. He stated that the Beale Street right-of-way is 82.5 feet wide, with two ten-foot sidewalks and a 62.5-foot roadway accommodating three moving lanes and two parking lanes. It is one-way southbound leading to the Beale Street on-ramp to the James Lick Freeway just across Mission Street. The Department of Public Works has requested that the sidewalk be widened only for the first 290 feet south of Market Street, so that Beale Street will be wide enough as it approaches the on-ramp to accommodate five lanes of moving traffic which could be done by instituting tow-away zones in the parking lanes. Mr. Jung noted that the block is 550 long.

Mr. Jung recommended that the Director be authorized to report that the change in the official sidewalk width from 10 to 14.5 feet on the east side of Beale Street from Market Street to go to a point 290 feet southerly is in conformity with the Master Plan.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if this street widening would remove one lane of traffic.Mr. Jung answered that there would be no loss of a traffic lane because the existing lanes would be narrowed slightly. Commissioner Kearney inquired how many stories are proposed for the new P.G. & E. high-rise to occupy this site. Mr. Jung responded that 34 stories are proposed, which would house a daytime population of 3,500 persons. Commissioner Fleishhacker then inquired if in this action the City would be deeding anything to P.G. & E. Mr. Jung responded in the negative.

Commissioner Elliott moved, and Commissioner Newman seconded the motion, that the Director be authorized to report that the change in official sidewalk width from 10 to 14.5 feet on the east side of Beale Street from Market Street to a point 290 feet southerly is in conformity with the Master Plan. The vote approving this motion was unanimous, 6 - 0.

R68.65 North Point Street, north side between Grant Avenue and Stockton Street; Grant Avenue, west side between North Point and Beach Streets. Change in official sidewalk width from zero feet to 10 feet.

Mr. Jung reported that B and D Properties, owner of a parcel of former Simmons Mattress Company property at the northwest corner of North Point Street and Grant Avenue, and the Otis Elevator Company, have joined in a request for re-establishment of the subject sidewalks with a width of 10 feet. The Simmons property formerly had a warehouse and storage yard on it, with a spur track next to the property line on North Point Street to be removed. A three-story office building will soon be built on the site and will require a sidewalk. Mr. Jung went on to explain that where there are sidewalks on North Point Street they are 10 feet wide. Furthermore, there is an official sidewalk width of 10 feet on the east side of Grant Avenue between North Point and Beach Streets. North Point Street has a total width of 68 feet 9 inches and Grant Avenue is 66 feet 9 inches.

Mr. Jung recommended that the Director be authorized to report that the change in official sidewalk widths from zero feet to 10 feet on the north side of North Point Street between Grant Avenue and Stockton Street, and on the west side of Grant Avenue between North Point and Beach Streets is in conformity with the Master Plan.

Commissioner Fleishhacker inquired whether or not this would affect traffic circulation. Mr. Jung stated that it would not.

Commissioner Kearney moved to accept the Director's recommendation, and Commissioner Wight seconded this motion. The vote of the Commission was unanimous in approval of the motion.

3:00 p.m.

DISCRETIONARY REVIEW OF APPLICATION FOR AN AUTOMOBILE WRECKING YARD TO BE LOCATED IN THE BLOCK BOUNDED BY DONAHUE, CARROLL, COLEMAN AND BANCROFT STREETS. (Taken under advisement from meeting of October 24, 1968.)

Wayne Rieke, Planner IV (Zoning), stated that several questions were raised at the previous hearing on this discretionary review matter. First, setting aside the question of whether or not this application is to be approved, is the Commission in a position to attach conditions to such an application? Mr. Rieke informed the Commission that they were in the position to attach conditions to the subject application. Second, if conditions were placed on the subject application, for what period of time could these conditions be granted? In response to this question, Mr. Rieke stated that the conditions could be granted for the duration of the subject permit. And third, would the subject application affect the South Bayshore Plan? Mr. Rieke stated that the subject application would not affect the South Bayshore Plan specifically, although an industrial land use was not proposed for placement in the location proposed by the applicant.

At this point in the meeting, Vice President Porter entered the room and assumed her place at the Commission table.

President Brinton asked the Director, Mr. Jacobs, for the staff recommendation on this matter. Mr. Jacobs stated that the staff recommendation was for disapproval of the subject application, based on the following points: The types of land uses appropriate for the area did not favor further industrial use at this time; discussions with people who live in the area were not favorable towards the subject application; and the proposal conflicts basically with the general land use plan proposed in the South Bayshore Plan and the general plan of the Bay Conservation and Development Commission.

Mr. Brinton asked if anyone in the audience wished to be heard on this matter. Mr. Axlerod rose, stating that he was the attorney for Mr. Cole, the applicant in this case. Mr. Axlerod stated that Mr. Cole's business would in no way affect environmental conditions in the area, or contribute to the potential problem of pollution of the Bay.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked Mr. Jacobs if the staff would still object to the proposed use if it were just a three-year temporary permit. Mr. Jacobs responded that the staff would still object to the proposed use because, in effect, it represents a step in the wrong direction, especially given the priority of specific land use needs for the whole South Bayshore area. Mr. Fleishhacker then asked the question of whether the Commission should not try to provide for land uses of all types, especially in cases where industrial land uses already exist. Mr. Jacobs responded that the City may not be able to provide for all types of land uses; for example, locations for a steel mill, a cemetery, a waste disposal plant, and others.

Commissioner Kearney then asked if discussions with community groups of the area had covered proposed land uses for the Candlestick Point area. Mr. Jacobs responded that definite land use proposals have been made to residents in the area, consisting primarily of housing and recreational land uses. Commissioner Kearney then stated that it would represent a breach of faith with residents of the area if the Commission should approve this application.

President Brinton then reported to the Commission that the Southeast Home Owners League had sent a telegram to the Commission opposing approval of the subject application.

Commissioner Fleishhacker then asked the applicant if any other site might be available for the use applied for. Mr. Cole, the applicant, responded in the negative.

Commissioner Kearney moved, and Commissioner Newman seconded the motion, to adopt the Director's recommendation for disapproval of the subject application. The vote of the Commission was 7 - 0 in favor of this motion.

President Brinton announced a recess in the meeting until 3:30 p.m.

3:30 p.m.

PRESENTATION OF STAFF REPORT ON PROPOSED LAND USE DISPOSITION OF FORT FUNSTON, FORT MILEY, AND FORT MASON PROPERTIES.

President Brinton requested Mr. Jacobs, the Director, to present the staff's report and recommendation on proposed disposition of Fort Mason, Fort Miley, and Fort Funston properties.

Mr. Jacobs stated that the Forts_ report was prepared in response to formal requests from the Office of the Mayor and the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Jacobs stressed that preparation of recommendations for Forts Miley and Funston was based solely in light of City needs matched against the Federal program of "surplus property for community development." Therefore, Fort Mason was considered separately, apart from the Federal program mentioned above. The Fort Mason property available for possible disposition at this time consists of approximately 39 acres defined as "excess property" by the General Services Administration. Of this 39 acres, the Army now occupies 25 acres, the Maritime Administration occupies two piers amounting to approximately five acres, with the remainder of the land area existing as open space. The Director then stated that possible land uses were considered and studied in depth for each Fort property according to the above conditions.

Mr. Jacobs reported that the approach of the staff in preparing this report was twofold. First, the Federal program, "surplus property for community development," was considered as to both its limitations and its opportunities for San Francisco. Secondly, the staff considered the total land use point of view, in light of long range needs and planning objectives of the City. In other words, the staff tried to maximize the City's planning goals and objectives in terms of the program's conditions.

Mr. Jacobs then began a presentation of the Fort Miley section of the Fort report. Edith Witt of the Human Rights Commission rose to request of the Commission that time be given between the presentation of the report today and the Commission's final recommendations and resolutions. Patrick Devaney seconded Miss Witt's recommendation.

At this point in the proceedings, Mr. Mellon took his place as Ex Officil Commissioner at the Commission table, and thereby requested that Commissioner Elliott step to the side as his alternate.

Mr. Jacobs responded to Miss Witt's suggestion by stating that the Planning Commission was asked initially to report to the Board of Supervisors by October 15. However, Supervisor Pelosi had allowed postponement of that deadline due to the importance of reaching sound planning conclusions and recommendations for the Fort properties. Mr. Jacobs assured Miss Witt that the staff had made careful inspection of each site in light of housing needs

of the community, only to be offset, of course, by additional City-wide needs for recreation facilities and open space, existing policy of the Master Plan, and existing zoning.

Mr. Jacobs then presented the staff's recommendations for all three Fort properties by reading extensively from the Fort report, entitled "Forts Mason, Miley and Funston," which is available for inspection in the files of the Department of City Planning, 100 Larkin Street, San Francisco.

President Brinton then opened the floor to questions concerning the Fort Miley recommendations, stating that each Fort proposal and following discussion would be voted upon separately by the Commission, rather than to adopt either the report or the individual recommendations all at once.

Commissioner Porter asked the Director if the Fort Miley property was not now designated as a "P" (public) land use in the Master Plan. Mr. Jacobs responded in the affirmative. Mrs. Porter then inquired as to what kind of rezoning would be required. Mr. Jacobs responded that requests for any new zoning would be based on the specific results to be achieved by the staff recommendations. Mrs. Porter stated that previous resolutions have required that planned unit development densities not exceed 10% of the particular residential zoning of the given property. Mr. Jacobs responded that density figures given in the report and recommended in the proposed resolution have been set down without regard to proposed zoning changes. If the plan should be adopted by the Board of Supervisors and become City policy, then details of zoning classification can be worked out at that time.

Howard Johnson, an architect representing clients for Fort Miley development, stated that the density figures should be less specific when related to final development plans. He stated that Fort Miley is a unique site, one which is underdeveloped and which should therefore maximize urban development. In placing schematic plans of his client on the wall, his proposal called for density which would exceed 40 dwelling units per acre. In the aggregate, his schematic rendering called for 548 units on Fort Miley's 12 acres. Additionally, one circular road would serve the site, and 80% of the trees now on the site would be preserved. Mr. Macris, Assistant Director-Plans and Programs, stated that the Forts report provided recommended guidelines only for future development of the Fort properties. Mr. Macris then asked Mr. Johnson what percent of the units in his rendering would be two, three, and four bedroom units. Mr. Johnson responded that his plans called for 256 three and four bedroom units, 196 units for elderly persons, and 100 one bedroom units. Mr. Macris then inquired about plans for parking in Mr. Johnson's rendering. Mr. Johnson responded that 50% of required parking would be on the surface and 50% below grade. Mr. Macris then asked whether or not a school was provided for in Mr. Johnson's plans. Mr. Johnson responded in the negative.

Commissioner Porter observed that Mr. Johnson's plans would require zoning in the range of R-5, whereas the staff's recommendation would call for

a zoning classification of R-3 or lower. Mr. Jacobs, at this point, added that flexibility in the staff's recommendation would not extend to consideration of 548 units. He stressed that socially-oriented programs, if followed, do not in fact seek conditions of maximum density. Mr. Johnson responded that the site is unique, one which is set aside from surrounding development, and therefore would allow for a break in height and planning requirements of sites located in normally builtup areas. Commissioner Newman then asked how many units would be eliminated from Mr. Johnson's plan by leaving the gun emplacements as is, rather than removing them as shown in Mr. Johnson's plan. Mr. Johnson responded that he could not answer to that point at this time.

Mr. Jacobs then agreed with Mr. Johnson that there are many good pieces of land to be developed to maximum potential, but that the real problem becomes one of attracting and helping families, especially those of moderate and low income, to meet their residential needs in the City. The emphasis, therefore, should be placed not on separateness but integration with existing neighborhoods. Vice President Porter remarked that after all, a major aim in the City today is to provide homes and a suitable environment wherever possible and appropriate. Mr. Johnson concluded this exchange by stating that a major objective of his proposal was to use a system's approach to the problem.

Mike Woods, of the Legal Assistance Foundation, asked about the cost per unit to low and moderate income families for housing at Forts Miley and Funston. Mr. Jacobs responded that the report did not address itself specifically to the cost of units to families, but rather to the levels of income range for families likely to be attracted to these possible developments. Mr. Johnson then rose to ask why the gun emplacements are shown remaining in the Fort Miley plan. Mr. Jacobs responded that there were three reasons why the staff recommendations did not call for removal of the gun emplacements: They are there; they are expensive to remove; and the objective has been to work within confines of present site conditions.

Mr. Devaney stated that the terms low income and moderate income have been used to speak of the type of families likely to be attracted to these units. Therefore, he asked for a definition of what these terms mean. Jim Paul, Planner III, responded that low, moderate, and middle income families were terms used consistent with housing programs of the Federal government, such as 221-D-3. President Brinton emphasized that the Department of Housing and Urban Development standards would be used in developing housing for these sites if development should occur.

Mr. Brinton then called for the question on the Fort Miley staff recommendations. Mr. Jacobs read a proposed resolution and presented it to the Commission for its consideration. Commissioner Porter moved, and Commissioner Fleishhacker seconded the motion, to adopt the staff recommendation as presented in the proposed resolution. The vote of the Commission was 7 - 0.

President Brinton then called for the question concerning recommenda-

tions for the Fort Funston property. Mr. Jacobs read the proposed resolution to the Commission. Commissioner Newman moved and Commissioner Kearney seconded the motion to adopt the proposed resolution as read by Mr. Jacobs.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked that before the vote was taken that he be able to question the walkway on the western side of the site, as shown in the staff recommendation for a proposed site plan. Mr. Jacobs responded that the buildings have been set back on the site because of possible erosion, and therefore, the walkway would be primarily a design problem which could be solved. Commissioner Porter then inquired about what would happen if residential development should not take place on the Fort Funston site. Mr. Jacobs responded that this would be a judgment to be made later.

President Brinton called for the vote. The vote of the Commission was 7 - 0 in favor of the staff recommendation.

President Brinton asked if there were any questions from the audience or the Commissioners concerning the Fort Mason staff recommendation.

Mr. James Canfield rose from the audience and asked why the Commission would not adopt a recommended plan for educational facilities and open space only, rather than including housing as a second priority use. Mr. Jacobs responded that the staff recommends very strongly the development of educational facilities and the retention of open space, but if that recommendation cannot be achieved, then the staff has recommended that other priorities be followed.

Mr. Woods rose to question the vagueness of the housing recommendation. He asked if the Commission has set any guidelines for a housing alternative. Mr. Jacobs responded that the staff has not set down firm guidelines for the housing recommendation because the provision of educational facilities is the strong case to be made, and that furthermore, if housing should be chosen as acceptable development for Fort Mason, then it would come back to us from the Board of Supervisors. Mr. Woods then inquired that if housing is to be recommended at a later point, would it be luxury housing or low income housing? Mr. Jacobs responded that he would defer on such a recommendation until a later time.

Commissioner Porter then inquired whether the existing park and open space on the north edge of Fort Mason would remain in any case. Mr. Jacobs responded affirmatively.

Michael Cruickshank asked if the educational facilities proposed would include racially-integrated schooling up to, and including, the secondary level. President Brinton responded that such conditions would be recommended.

David Bickford Gideon, attorney at law, asked what would happen if the Federal Government does not accept the recommended educational facility

as a viable proposal. President Brinton responded that the Commission would cross that bridge when it gets to it.

Mrs. Dearman rose from the audience to ask why the Planning Commission should take public lands and parks for these three proposals. As an alternative, she asked why doesn't the Commission look at vacant lots and properties instead? Mr. Macris explained that we are not taking public lands or public parks. In fact, he continued, we are proposing that additional park space be created should the City decide to acquire these Fort properties.

President Brinton asked to read the staff recommendations as stated in the proposed resolution for Fort Mason. Upon completion of reading the proposed resolution, Commissioner Porter moved, and Commissioner Kearney seconded the motion, to accept the staff recommendation for possible disposition of the Fort Mason property. The vote of the Commission was 7 - 0 to accept this motion.

Hearing no further comments from the audience, President Brinton adjourned the meeting at 5:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

R. Bruce Anderson
Acting Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the Special Meeting of November 20, 1968, held jointly with the San Francisco Port Authority.

The City Planning Commission and the San Francisco Port Authority met pursuant to notice on Wednesday, November 20, 1968, at 2:30 P.M. in the Chambers of the Board of Supervisors.

PRESENT: City Planning Commission: William M. Brinton, President; Mrs. Charles B. Porter, Vice President; Virgil L. Elliott, Walter S. Newman, and Walter W. Wight, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: City Planning Commission: Mortimer Fleishhacker, Jr. and James S. Kearney.

PRESENT: San Francisco Port Authority: Cyril Magnin, President; James J. Rudden, Daniel E. London, Trevor C. Roberts, and Sam H. Husbands, Jr., Commissioners of the San Francisco Port Authority.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation; William Proctor, Planner IV; Edward Michael, Planner III; and R. Bruce Anderson, Acting Secretary.

PRESENTATION OF NORTHERN WATERFRONT PLAN

Chairman William M. Brinton called the meeting to order at 2:45 P.M. Mr. Brinton issued a special welcome to the Port Commissioners for sitting with the Planning Commission in this joint session to review a presentation of the Northern Waterfront Plan by John S. Bolles Associates.

President Brinton of the City Planning Commission set forth the purpose of this meeting. He explained that John S. Bolles Associates would make a final presentation of the Northern Waterfront Plan and that no Commission action would be required at this time. Therefore, at today's meeting, there would be no public discussion, comments or questions. Any and all public meetings will be scheduled after copies of the Plan have been distributed and people have had the opportunity to study it. The staff of the City Planning Commission and the San Francisco Port Authority have been working with the consultants on this Plan for over two years.

President Brinton then recognized those Planning Commissioners who have served on the Northern Waterfront Committee; he introduced Commissioners Porter, Kearney and Newman.

President Brinton expressed his particular thanks to the Citizens Advisory Committee for their help and assistance throughout the evolution of the Plan and for their constructive criticism of the many preliminary plans as presented during the planning process. Mr. Brinton then read from a list of those groups which formed this Committee, including the Greater San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, Fisherman's Wharf Merchants Association, ILWU, Joint Committee on Urban Design, North Waterfront Associates, Russian Hill Improvement Association, San Francisco Beautiful, San Francisco Maritime Museum, State Division of Beaches and Parks, SPUR, Telegraph Hill Dwellers and Crab Boat Owners Association.

Thanks were also due to the various governmental agencies which, along with the Citizens Advisory Committee, assisted greatly in the development of the Plan. Numerous City Departments contributed, namely, Police, Fire, Real Estate, Recreation and Park, Assessor, City Attorney, Public Works, and the Public Utilities Commission, including the Water Department, Utilities Engineering Bureau and Municipal Railway. Other agencies cited were the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, San Francisco Housing Authority, San Francisco Parking Authority, San Francisco Port Authority, Bay Conservation and Development Commission, and the State Department of Public Works, which would include Division of Highways and Division of Bay Toll Crossings.

Chairman Brinton then asked if President Magnin of the Port Authority would care to make a statement at this time. Mr. Magnin responded that the Port Authority most certainly welcomed the study and Plan. After all, he stated, the Port is the greatest beneficiary, as it owns most of the land included in the study and Plan. Mr. Magnin also stated that the Port Authority has every wish to cooperate with the Planning Commission in the meaningful effectuation of this Plan.

Chairman Brinton then asked the Director of Planning for his comments, and following any comments he would wish to make, if he would then introduce the consultants for their presentation of the Plan.

Mr. Jacobs opened his remarks by stating that the study and preliminary plans were well under way when he became Director of Planning. However, Mr. Jacobs explained, he had been briefed thoroughly by John S. Bolles and Associates and the Department's staff prior to his involvement with this significant study. Mr. Jacobs stated that the Department's staff has worked closely with the consultants, John S. Bolles Associates, and Arthur D. Little, Inc., and with the many organizations involved. Many ideas have been bandied about; some accepted, some rejected, and others looked at with much scrutiny.

A preliminary presentation of the Plan was made about six months ago. Along side of the planning process involved with preparation of the Northern Waterfront Plan has been continual change and new construction in the Northern Waterfront area, much of which has been carried out in basic conformity with the Plan.

Mr. Jacobs concluded his remarks by stating that the Plan ultimately must say something, and that it must remain flexible within a framework conducive to further development in the best interests of San Francisco. He expressed particular appreciation to Mr. Steele of the City Planning staff, who has worked so closely with the consultants, the Port and the various citizens groups involved. Mr. Jacobs then introduced John S. Bolles.

Mr. Bolles began his remarks by drawing upon his twelve years of association with people such as Cyril Magnin, Mrs. Charles B. Porter, James Kearney, and Jim Rudden in planning for this area of San Francisco. He also expressed special thanks to members of his staff who had worked so diligently on the study and Plan.

Mr. Bolles explained that while the Plan has been prepared under contract with the City Planning Commission, the contents and implications of this Plan have been worked out with both the Planning Commission and the Port Authority. Both the Planning Commission and the Port Authority have authorized this study and Plan. The purpose of the study, Mr. Bolles continued, is to guide development of the San Francisco Harbor in the best interests of the City. Mr. Bolles further pointed out the instrumental role of the Northern Waterfront Citizens Advisory Committee in developing this Plan. This group has made key decisions all along the way.

In his concluding remarks, Mr. Bolles stated that the Northern Waterfront area is currently in a stage of significant transition. Only the most refined development should be permitted in order to allow the harmonious and industrial placement of new uses. Mr. Bolles then introduced Barry Wasserman, the Project Captain for the John Bolles staff.

Mr. Wasserman presented a full description of the Northern Waterfront Plan through the use of slides and narrative, and in reference to a model built expressly for this study and Plan. Copies of the Northern Waterfront Plan, from which Mr. Wasserman drew highlights and the significant detail of his presentation, are available for examination in the files of the City Planning Department at 100 Larkin Street.

Chairman Brinton expressed his appreciation to Mr. Wasserman, Mr. Bolles, the staff of the Department of City Planning, and to all others who made this presentation and special meeting possible.

Chairman Brinton then read a letter addressed to the City Planning Commission from Mayor Joseph L. Alioto. The letter read as follows:

"May I extend my congratulations to the City Planning Commission, the San Francisco Port Authority, the Citizens and Technical Advisory Committees, and to John S. Bolles Associates for the monumental Northern Waterfront Plan. The Plan blends the 3.5 miles of waterfront into an imaginative array of maritime facilities, view areas, homes and commercial enterprise.

In my opinion, the Plan should be adopted in its present form, hopefully with only minor amendments, bearing in mind that its goals and objectives are so stated that they will permit development of the full potential of the Northern Waterfront in accord with the unusual opportunities presented by its relation to the Bay and to the port and downtown, and its unique aesthetic qualities offered by water, topography, views of the City and the Bay and its maritime character. The adoption of the plan does not preclude any innovative concepts presented by developers which may be at variance with specific statements in the plan, but which are, in the total picture, highly desirable.

I hope the plan will become more than advisory in nature. No comprehensive design of an area, such as the Northern Waterfront Plan, can be interpreted rigidly and respond to each single development proposal. Nevertheless, the plan offers sufficient flexibility to accommodate the maximum potential of this area in the highest and best interest of the City of San Francisco as well as private developers. One of the best products of a planning study is that developers know not only what they can do, but know what they can expect others will be compelled to do in preserving the environment envisioned in this fine piece of work.

With the acquisition of the port, we must proceed with all deliberate speed to bring about the transformation that will continue to spur business development in San Francisco, while adding dazzling urban beauty."

Chairman Brinton stated in conclusion that public meetings would be scheduled after the Plan has been studied by all interested parties. He, therefore, encouraged people to pick up a copy and study it, so that when public hearings are scheduled, meaningful comments can result.

President Brinton of the Planning Commission adjourned the meeting at 4:10 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

R. Bruce Anderson
Acting Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, November 21, 1968.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, November 21, 1968, at 1:00 P.M. at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: William M. Brinton, President; Mrs. Charles B. Porter, Vice President; Virgil L. Elliott and Walter W. Wight, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: Commissioners Mortimer Fleishhacker, Jr., James S. Kearney and Walter S. Newman.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation; Edward I. Murphy, Assistant Director of Planning; Samuel Jung, Planner IV; Ralph Mead, Planner IV (Zoning); Marie Carlberg, Planner III; and R. Bruce Anderson, Acting Secretary.

Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner. Scott Blakey represented the San Francisco Chronicle.

1:00 P.M. - Field Trip

Members of the Planning Commission and staff departed from 100 Larkin Street at 1:00 P.M. to take a field trip to properties scheduled for consideration during the Commission Zoning hearing on December 5, 1968.

2:15 P.M. - 100 Larkin Street

CURRENT MATTERS

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, reported that on this afternoon's calendar two referrals are shown for consideration by the Commission. Mr. Jacobs stated that he would like to add a third referral for this afternoon, to be heard following the first two. This referral would be R68.77, a pedestrian bridge across Kearny Street which would link the Chinese Cultural and Trade Center with Portsmouth Square.

The Director then called the attention of the Commission to a memorandum on recommended follow-up actions to the Mission Street Station Areas Design Study report. Mr. Jacobs then read parts of this memorandum, which are listed below:

"The Mission Transit Station Areas Design Study report by Urban Design Associates focuses essentially on two sets of action recommendations: one long range in aspect and the second short range and immediate in timing. The long range deals with such

matters as overall circulation, height, bulk, zoning and urban design considerations, and the short range concerns itself primarily with advancing the design of the public improvements in the street areas immediately adjoining the two transit stations at 16th and 24th Streets so that the City's program of improvements can be coordinated with BARTD's construction program.

It is my opinion that, in the light of present staff commitments indicated in the departmental work program, the long range considerations for the Mission Street area very properly could be included in such current and future studies of the Department, and possibly the Model Cities program. Any major building development in the Mission Street area proposed in the intervening period of these studies could be reviewed by the staff in terms of the general design considerations contained in this report.

Regarding short range actions that are needed to implement the recommendations in the report, the following is submitted:

Consideration - Advancing sketch designs for restoration of street surface in station areas to complete architectural and construction plans.

Because of the need to coordinate the City's plans for the improvement of the street areas on Mission Street adjoining the transit stations as funded in the recently approved bond issue with the BARTD construction timetable for the restoration of the street surface of Mission Street at the transit stations, it is essential that the City's design and construction plans for the improvement of the street areas be carried forward as quickly as possible. Presently, the BARTD construction timetable calls for the restoration of the street surface between 22nd and 23rd Streets over the cross-over box structure to commence in April, 1969, and the street restoration above the 24th and 16th Street stations to commence in December, 1969 and January, 1970, respectively.

Recommendation

We are in general accord with the Consultants' conclusion for a wider sidewalk and in no case could we support a sidewalk width less than the existing sidewalk width of 15 feet as studied in Scheme C. However, we are not convinced that a four foot wider sidewalk (19' wide) is the optimum width. Because of the bus loading and service and delivery problems on Mission Street, we believe that some of the proposed additional width of the sidewalk could be given to widening the vehicular lanes. Accordingly, we would accept a two foot wider sidewalk (17 feet) if such could be approved by the Department of Public Works and the

and the other affected City departments. However, if concurrence with this width could not be obtained within the time limitations given, then we would recommend that the Department of Public Works proceed into the next design phase with the sidewalks retained at their present width of 15 feet.

It is also our desire and intention that the Department assist the Director of Public Works in an advisory capacity on the design of the improvements in the public areas in a manner similar to the arrangement on Market Street.

Consideration - Plaza areas (pg. 39 of report).

'To clarify spatial relationship and bring order to the street intersection, it is recommended to emphasize the openness of the larger plaza and to de-emphasize the smaller. At the larger plaza the tree planting should become a specific focal form, circular in shape reflecting the circular entranceway below. The remainder of the plaza space will be free of trees creating a broad openness. At the smaller plaza it is recommended that the reverse should occur, with the plaza heavily planted, merging with the street trees. General overall form of the tree planting should reflect the shape of the entrances -- the squareness of one and the roundness of the other.'

Recommendation

The staff recommends acceptance of the above design consideration, but is aware that this area of concern falls primarily within the responsibilities of BARTD. We therefore recommend that BARTD incorporate this concept in the final designs and that these designs be coordinated with the overall design concept proposed in the Consultants' recommendations.

Consideration - Plaza areas (pg. 39 of report).

'The buildings that surround the square will largely determine whether they will be successful, strongly shaped, memorable open spaces. Viewed from across the square, they must be seen as a harmonious group. At the ground level they must be planned to interact with each other and coordinate with the activity generated by the subway stations. Common pedestrian walkways and arcades should be jointly developed. In order to attain these objectives, public over-seeing in the form of a continuous on-going community design review process is required.'

Recommendation

The staff is sympathetic to the objectives expressed in the above design considerations; however, the establishment of a Mission

District community review committee to review all new buildings, remodelings, and signs in special review zones, as recommended on pages 51 and 52 of the report, should initiate on a voluntary basis from the community itself. The staff, within its resources, would assist in the formation of such a review committee. In the interim, or in the absence of such a committee, the City Planning Commission could exercise discretionary review over all building applications in the station areas.

Most important at this time, however, is that BARTD encourage buildings and shops to open directly onto the plazas. This should be the design policy of the City and should be pursued by the staff of the Department.

Design consideration - Planting (pg. 41 of report).

'The over-all tree planting plan is based upon a rhythm of trees planted on a base module of 24 feet. Palm trees are recommended as the major vehicular scaled trees and are to be grown ultimately to great heights. They are spaced at either 24, 72 or 96 foot centers depending upon their location along the street; in mid-zone of the street they are spaced the furthest apart and at the station areas they are clustered. Between the palms are planted smaller, pedestrian-scaled evergreen trees, or if maintenance can be assured highly colorful flowering vines can be trained on special trellis-frames. The over-all effect would be that of a palm-lined shopping street, unique in San Francisco, and the palm could become a symbol of the area.'

Recommendation

The staff recommendations regarding certain features of the planting plan are as follows:

1. Spacing - the placement of the palm trees at 24 feet, 72 or 96 foot centers depending upon their location on the street is an acceptable design concept.

2. Palm trees - the selection of the Mexican Fan Palm Tree as the major vehicular scaled tree is endorsed. These tall trees can be seen from great distances and will add an important supplemental design character to the street in combination with the smaller, pedestrian scaled trees. However, it should be noted that the consensus of opinion of the members of the Mission Merchants Association was not in accord with the selection of this tree

because they could not 'grasp its contribution to pedestrian level environment nor its relation to the historic concept of the Mission District.'

3. Evergreen trees - the planting of pedestrian scaled evergreen trees between the palm trees is approved; however, the specific specie should be determined in consultation with the Street Tree Planting Division of the Department of Public Works.

4. Vines on special trellis frames - the substitution of vines on special trellis frames for the evergreen trees is not recommended because of the problems of added maintenance and protection from vandalism of such installations.

Design Consideration - Paving (pg. 42 of report).

'The sidewalk paving is designed to be warm in color and texture. Approximately one-third of the area is recommended to be paved in brick to establish the over-all character of the street. Exposed aggregate concrete and precast concrete paving blocks are proposed to be used in combination with the brick.'

Recommendation

The staff recommends acceptance of the paving design principles as presented with the assurance from the consultants that the type of brick selected will be non-skid and of thin bond.

Design Consideration - Street Intersection Design (pg. 43 of report).

'Function and safety are the major determinants of the proposed street intersection design. Essential information must be communicated directly to people in autos, buses, trucks, and on foot. The grouping and placement of these items of public information thus determines the intersection design.

It is recommended that at each corner of the intersection the major items of signs and equipment should be grouped and mounted upon a single, heavy steel pole, approximately one foot in diameter. It would also carry the traffic control signs, street signs, directional signs, and pedestrian controls. The pole would contain all the required electrical services and could include a special Mission Street symbol and special vehicular and pedestrian street lighting. These poles could also support a single multi-directional traffic signal and street light suspended in the center of the intersection. Special seasonal displays can be mounted upon it as required. In addition to organizing and eliminating the street corner clutter, the poles will establish the major design elements of the intersection.'

Recommendation

The staff recommends acceptance of the street intersection design principles for forwarding to the Department of Public Works for further detailing in the next design phase.

Design Consideration - Sidewalks (pg. 45 of report).

'The sidewalk area is divided in 3 parallel functional zones, running the length of the street. The first zone, the area adjacent to the street, historically has contained the many varied activities that give the sense of urban life and vitality to the street. Here are located the occasional activities such as outdoor displays, seasonal and holiday events; the magazine vending stands, flower stands, advertising information kiosks; and the places for dispensing of newspapers. This zone also contains all the mid-block items of street equipment and furniture, such as benches, lights, trash receptacles, drinking fountains, and planting boxes.

The second area is the movement zone between the stores and the trees. It is devoted to the demands of ease of pedestrian mobility and good visual contact with the sidewalk area ahead.

The third zone is adjacent to the store windows and building entrances. It is the place for window shopping and entrances and exits to the buildings.'

Recommendation

The staff recommends acceptance of the above described sidewalk design principles.

Design Consideration - Street Equipment and Furniture (pg. 47 of report).

'The design objective for the various items of street equipment, such as fire hydrants, mail boxes, police and fire call boxes and transformers, is to improve their discordant and cluttered aspects and to discipline their appearance. For these major public elements, which are uniform throughout the city, no change in design is recommended, they should be simply coordinated in heights, and mounted upon a uniform, standard modular pole base.'

Recommendation

The staff recommends acceptance of the above design objectives for street equipment and furniture for forwarding to the Department of Public Works for further detailing in the next design plan stage.

Mr. Jacobs then asked that the Director be authorized to submit the foregoing memorandum and recommendations to the Director of Public Works for his consideration in the improvement of the public areas adjoining the Mission Street transit stations.

President Brinton asked if the design consultants agreed with the above presentation. Mr. Don Head, representing the design consultants, stated that the presentation was acceptable. Mr. Brinton then asked if the Mission Street Merchants Association agreed with the above presentation, and a spokesman for the group answered in the affirmative.

It was moved by Vice President Porter, and seconded by Commissioner Elliott, that the Director be authorized to submit the foregoing memorandum and recommendations to the Director of Public Works for his consideration in the improvement of the public areas adjoining the Mission Street transit station. The vote was 4 - 0.

Commissioner Elliott asked if the Acting Secretary would please acquire copies of the recent City and County Record, which features Mr. Jacobs, the Director, and the work of the Department of City Planning. Mr. Anderson answered that he would contact Mrs. Allen at the City and County Record Offices, and provide copies of this magazine for the next meeting of the Commission.

REFERRALS

R68.57 Revocable permit to occupy easterly half of Tennessee Street between 23rd and 24th Streets; all of Tennessee Street between 24th Street and 200 feet southerly; all of 24th Street between Third and Tennessee Streets; and the southerly half of 24th Street between Tennessee and Minnesota Streets.

Samuel Jung, Planner IV, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the applicant, Marvin Realty Company, had

requested permission to occupy Tennessee and 24th Streets where they front its property, for the purposes of open storage. This would close 24th Street between Third and Tennessee Streets and Tennessee Street for 200 feet south of 24th Street. The easterly half of Tennessee Street between 23rd and 24th Streets and the southerly half of 24th Street between Tennessee and Minnesota Streets would also be occupied, making a total of 51,800 square feet of street space available for the use of the petitioner. If the revocable permit is granted, Cleveland Wrecking Company intends to use 24th Street east of Tennessee Street as a customer parking area with a controlled exit to Third Street. The other street areas would be enclosed by a six-foot chain link fence and used for open storage of heavy equipment and meterials. The proposal would completely block two streets to through traffic, but nearby businesses would have access by other routes.

The easterly half of Tennessee Street, which would be occupied between 23rd and 24th Streets, is at a higher elevation than the westerly half, which has a railroad track in it. At times when there are cars on the track, the westerly half would be blocked to traffic. Tennessee Street, 80 feet wide, is not improved in this block.

Twenty-fourth Street between Tennessee and Minnesota Streets is 66 feet wide and the southerly half requested for closing under the revocable permit is at a higher elevation than the northerly half at the intersection with Minnesota Street.

Minnesota Street is unimproved except for a sewer which is now being installed, and there are no plans for improvement. There is a paint warehouse in the block northwest of Cleveland Wrecking Company, bordered by these portions of Tennessee and 24th Streets with access on Minnesota.

Twenty-third Street will be improved between Third and Iowa Streets during the next year.

The Fire Department objects to three of the four proposed street closings, because there are no fire hydrants on 24th Street either at Tennessee or Minnesota Streets. Hydrants are located on Third Street, 23rd and 25th Streets, on the latter at Tennessee and Minnesota, and the Fire Department believes that the streets should be kept open to bring hoses in from these hydrants. The Fire Department does not object to the closing of the southerly half of 24th Street, between Tennessee and Minnesota Streets.

President Brinton then asked for the Director's recommendation. Mr. Jacobs recommended that the proposed revocable encroachment permit to occupy the easterly half of Tennessee Street between 23rd and 24th Streets, all of Tennessee Street between 24th Street and 200 feet southerly and all of 24th Street between Third and Tennessee Streets, is not in conformity with the Master Plan because it would interfere with effective fire protection. Mr. Jacobs further recommended that the proposed revocable encroachment permit to occupy the southerly half of 24th Street between Tennessee and Minnesota Streets does not affect the Master Plan.

President Brinton asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak on this matter.

John Winter, Vice President and General Manager of Cleveland Wrecking Company, stated that for years his company has worked with the City's Engineering Department to clean up areas and streets of the constant collection of refuse. He also stated that parts of the streets applied for in this referral are seldom used, and that his company will continue to clean up the area which they would occupy. Furthermore, if any streets are to be improved in the future, Cleveland Wrecking Company will be happy to move off those streets. Mr. Winter then presented pictures to show present conditions of the streets in the area which would be affected. He stated that there have been accidents involving vehicles in this area for some time, although the streets are not being used heavily at the present.

Chief Condon, of the San Francisco Fire Department, then rose to state that he agreed that streets affected are seldom used. But he did say that Fire Department accessibility would be hampered severely if these streets were to be occupied by the applicant. Chief Condon said that combustible uses in the close quartering of the buildings within the area present a definite hazard in terms of potential fires breaking out. In closing, he agreed with Mr. Jacobs that if noncombustible materials are stored on these streets, then the situation would be different.

Mrs. Andrew Gallagher introduced herself and stated that she had a 30-year interest in this area. She stated that, based on previous fires in this area, and the manner in which the Fire Department was able to handle them, that she couldn't see why these street closings would affect either the potential of fire or fire fighting procedures. She stressed that the request of the Cleveland Wrecking Company is only a temporary one.

Jesse S. Marks, a property owner on Tennessee Street, expressed his concern about fire hazards in the area. He also expressed his concern about only one day's notice for this hearing. Mr. Jung explained that under requirements of the Charter, referrals do not require notification to abutting property owners when a hearing is to be held, but rather the Department of City Planning contacts parties likely to be interested in such hearings only as a courtesy.

Mrs. Porter then asked Mr. Marks if he was in agreement with the Director's recommendation. Mr. Marks stated that he was. Mr. Marks then went on to mention a past fire on Minnesota Street between 24th and 25th Streets, and Cleveland Wrecking Company's junk in the area.

Mr. Robert Mollar, of Western Woodcrafting Company, stated that his firm is just now moving into the area and that they expect innumerable truck deliveries each day. The closing of these streets, he said, would affect his business.

Mr. Adolph J. Lunna, a general contractor, reaffirmed Mr. Mollar's concerns.

President Brinton then called for the question. Mrs. Porter moved, and Mr. Wight seconded, that the Director's recommendation be accepted. The vote was 4 - 0.

R68.69 Vacation of a portion of Niagara Avenue westerly of San Jose Avenue.

Mr. Jung explained that the small portion of Niagara Avenue proposed for vacation, approximately 50 feet deep by 60 feet wide, is now cut off by the Southern Freeway and lies between two parcels of Municipal Property, formerly used as a paint shop and now used for bus storage. BART will purchase the City property and vacate this street area for use in its right-of-way and as a parking area for the Balboa Park Station. Niagara Avenue is an easement street.

President Brinton called for the Director's recommendation. Mr. Jacobs recommended that the Director of Planning be authorized to report that the vacation of Niagara Street westerly of San Jose Avenue as shown on SUR-3068 is in conformity with the Master Plan.

Commissioner Wight moved, and Vice President Porter seconded, to accept the Director's recommendation. President Brinton called for the vote, which was 4 - 0.

R68.77 Pedestrian bridge across Kearny Street from Chinese Cultural and Trade Center to Portsmouth Square.

Mr. Jung explained that this referral is involved with the old Hall of Justice site on Kearny Street between Washington and Merchant Streets, which is being redeveloped by Justice Enterprises as a Chinese Cultural and Trade Center consisting of a 460-car garage in five basement levels and a 26-story hotel building with 562 rooms, with the third floor of 17,384 square feet devoted to cultural center, auditorium, storage, and mechanical facilities. The first floor, Mr. Jung said, will contain retail stores and the hotel lobby; the second floor will contain dining rooms and cocktail lounges; and the fourth floor offices. There will be 316,132 square feet of floor space in the building, exclusive of the garage.

The proposal before the Planning Commission is for a 27.5 foot wide pedestrian bridge, connecting the third floor with the center of Portsmouth Square across Kearny Street. The bridge proper, starting from the foot of the grand staircase leading to the third floor, will cross Kearny Street about 19 feet above street level. It will bisect the small children's play area in Portsmouth Square with a clearance of 10 to 12 feet and terminate in the sitting area to the west. There will be a cutout in the floor of the bridge 11 feet wide and 67 feet long where it crosses the playground, to lessen the shadow which will be cast.

The idea of the bridge originated in the Rapid Transit Corridor Study, which included the study of possible redevelopment of privately-owned properties between the Golden Gateway at Battery Street and the old Hall of Justice site. An elevated pedestrian way along three blocks of Merchant Street was suggested to connect with the elevated pedestrian levels in the Golden Gateway, and with Portsmouth Square, although a narrower connection was shown to the park on the schematic drawings than the bridge presently proposed.

Mr. Jung reviewed the actions of numerous bodies dating back to 1965, all concerned with the development of this bridge. He stated that these bodies had taken actions to show a fairly strong commitment to such a bridge.

The staff, Mr. Jung said, has been and is concerned that the design and location of such a bridge do not conflict with existing play space in the Square, and that any decrease in usefulness of the play area be compensated for by a new and extended play area at the expense of the developer and satisfactory to the Recreation and Park Commission.

President Brinton called for comments from those in the audience who wished to be heard on this matter.

M. Justin Herman, Executive Director of San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, stated that the purpose of this referral in coming before the Planning Commission is to seek approval of the pedestrian bridge over Kearny Street. Mr. Herman recalled that the Board of Supervisors has looked at and been involved with this bridge for the past one and one-half years. Additionally, he said, this project has received the approval of the Art Commission and the Recreation and Park Commission. The bridge is part of a contract between the Redevelopment Agency and the developer, Justice Enterprises.

Mr. Herman explained that the bridge is different today that it was one and one-half years ago when it was first proposed. The developer needs approval soon, because he is now in the construction stage. The bridge, he said, will be 28 feet wide. Recently a trip was made to Taiwan to guage interest of the Chinese government in such a project, and shortly an architect from Taiwan will come to make his own embellishments of this bridge.

Mr. Herman stated that the Recreation and Park Commission had approved in concept that such play area as is covered by the bridge shall be matched by a substitute amount of play area in another section of Portsmouth Square. He explained that the bridge will cover 6% of the park. On the other hand, the bridge will add seven times the amount of public space as the amount of public space the bridge will cover in the play area.

Commissioner Elliott asked Mr. Herman where the substitute play area will be provided. Mr. Herman responded that this issue has yet to be resolved. But most likely, he stated, it will be provided north and south of the bridge contiguous to the present play area.

Commissioner Porter asked why the bridge must be built in the first place. Furthermore, she asked, is there no substitute way to provide for the same function of moving persons across Kearny Street? Mr. Herman responded that the bridge is designed to catch the flavor of grand entrances so common to Oriental museums. Additionally, the bridge will provide a location for sculptural pieces.

Merrill Jew, an architect, who identified himself as a representative of the Chinese-American Citizens Alliance, recognized that the idea is endorsed by the Supervisors and the City Planning Commission. And he stated that he did not wish to argue with the concept. However, he did wish to argue with the size and location of the bridge. In 1965, Mr. Jew stated, the Board of Supervisors and the City Planning Commission approved a bridge alligned with Merchant Street so that open space and recreation so crucial to this area could be preserved. At this point in time, Chinatown cannot afford palatial bridges of the type now before the Commission, given the high density and land-starved land use conditions of Chinatown. Furthermore, Mr. Jew asked how the City Planning Commission, in putting together the Mini-Park program, could deny and take away existing park area. Mr. Jew concluded by saying that Chinatown should get both the bridge and the new park area, and that such objectives could be met if the bridge were placed in another location, with the present play area left intact.

Leonard L. Chang, who identified himself as a member of an economic opportunity agency in Chinatown, stated that he was in favor of this proposal, as it will afford safe passage for mothers and children who wish to cross Kearny Street. He felt that the play area will not be decimated, and that with the opening in the bridge to allow for sunlight, there will be no injurious effects to those playing and sitting beneath the bridge. He recommended that the City Planning Commission issue a "do pass."

George Wu, who stated that he works with people on the street, said that he has talked with people who are down there right now, and that their feelings show that the Cultural and Trade Center should be opened as soon as possible. Mr. Wu stressed that the link is needed only to get the Chinese Cultural and Trade Center built. How the link is accomplished, according to Mr. Wu, is not important. Mr. Wu said that this project has gone on too long in the discussion stage. What must be done now is to open the Center as soon as possible.

Mr. J. K. Choy, speaking on behalf of the Chinese Cultural Foundation, the Chinese Chamber of Commerce, and the Greater Chinese Community Services Association, mentioned the names of many public officials and organizations who sent letters to the Commission in support of this pedestrian bridge. Mr. Choy stated that without the bridge the Chinese Cultural and Trade Center would not have the proper image and, in effect, would not work. He went on to say that all of Chinatown wants the bridge; and, after all, 80% of the people who will use the Cultural and Trade Center will be Chinese. Mr. Choy also stressed that the aesthetic import of the bridge would be great as an attraction to visitors, and that without the bridge, it would be difficult for citizens of the area to get into the Chinese Cultural and Trade Center.

Harold Moose, President of Justice Enterprises, recommended that the Planning Commission grant a "do pass" to this request for a pedestrian bridge. He maintained that if the City Planning Commission did not approve the bridge at this point, the permit would be held up with the consequence of great expense to the developer. Mr. Moose recalled that there have been many meetings with the Redevelopment Agency staff and people of the area over the course of long months in the past and, in fact, costly delays have already occurred in trying to get this bridge from the planning stage to the point of actual construction. In summary, Mr. Moose stated that the bridge would be turned over to the Chinese Cultural and Trade Center to the benefit of citizens and visitors alike.

President Brinton called for the Director's recommendation.

Mr. Jacobs recommended that the Director of Planning be authorized to report that the proposed bridge is, in principle, in conformity with the Master Plan, subject to the following provisions:

1. The bridge pier shall be located at the rear of the sidewalks on Kearny Street rather than at the curbs.

2. The minimum vertical clearance between the bridge structure and the Kearny Street roadway shall be 15 feet.

3. Compensatory play space, equal in area to that overcrossed by the bridge, shall be provided by the developer elsewhere in Portsmouth Square, preferably to the south of and adjacent to the existing play space and to the satisfaction of the Recreation and Park Commission.

4. The developer shall provide adequate night lighting on the bridge and on the play area under the bridge.

5. The developer shall provide permanent benches on the bridge.

6. Final plans shall be subject to review and approval by the Department of City Planning.

President Brinton asked if there were any other questions from the audience.

Mr. Jew rose to reiterate his concerns, namely, is it not possible to separate the bridge from the building and would further delay really be that crucial to completion of the Chinese Cultural and Trade Center.

The project manager of the Chinese Cultural and Trade Center objected to placement of the bridge piers on the rear of the sidewalk rather than on the curb, because of sub-basement areas of auxiliary uses beneath the sidewalk area. Mr. Jacobs responded that this issue could be resolved when the developer brought his final plans to the attention of the staff of the Department.

Hearing no further questions, President Brinton called for the pleasure of the Commission on this question. Commissioner Elliott moved, and Commissioner Porter seconded the Director's recommendation. The vote was 4 - 0 in favor of the Director's recommendation.

3:00 P.M. - Room 282 City Hall

4. PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED PLANNING AMENDMENT CONCERNING FOSTER HOMES AND FAMILY CARE HOMES (Under advisement from meeting of September 26, 1968.)

President Brinton apologized to the large number of persons sitting in the audience for the delay of 45 minutes in beginning this hearing.

President Brinton stated that items four and five would be considered together, due to their related nature and the late hour. The format of the

hearing would include first the Director's report and recommendations, then a hearing of comments from the public, both pro and con to these recommendations, followed finally by the Commission's vote. Mr. Brinton then asked Mr. Steele to begin the presentation.

Mr. Steele began the presentation on the proposed planning code amendment concerning foster homes and family care homes. He stated that on March 6, 1968, the Planning and Development Committee of the Board of Supervisors referred to this Department, for review and recommendation, a proposed ordinance introduced by Supervisor Morrison. This ordinance would amend the definition of "family" in the City Planning Code to include "not more than six persons placed in a foster home or family care home by a governmental social agency or duly licensed agency." It would also exclude homes for aged from the principal uses permitted only in R-2 and less restrictive zoning districts. The proponents of this legislation are public and private social agencies which establish and support foster and family care homes.

A variety of terms is employed by social agencies to indicate the uses with which this amendment is concerned, including "foster home," "family home," "family care home," "group home," and "boarding home for the aged." The term used varies according to the particular agency and program involved. For example, a "foster home" is supervised by the San Francisco Department of Social Services, while a "family home" for mentally retarded is supervised by the California Department of Mental Hygiene. A "group home" is one set up and operated directly by a social agency.

The common characteristic of all these kinds of homes is that they are small scale uses occurring in a residential setting and providing 24-hour care of persons, who by reason of age, or physical and mental condition, can not live in complete independence. The "caretaker" in these homes may be a single person or a married couple, either with or without children of her or their own; sometimes (as in a "group home") the caretaker may be in the employ of this supervisory social agency.

The purpose of foster and family homes is generally stated in terms of the desire to approximate "normal" family living as closely as possible. Thus, the persons cared for are encouraged to participate in the life and activities of the general community to the greatest extent possible, consistent with their limitations. For example, children will attend the local public school where possible. The "clients" in these homes are selected with this purpose in mind, and for this reason should not be persons whose problems are so serious that they could not benefit from a "family" setting. Thus, according to the social agencies, intensive medical or nursing care, or other activities inappropriate to a "family" setting, are not provided in these homes.

The Planning Code makes no specific mention of foster homes or family care homes. The Code does, however, specify homes for aged within a dwelling unit for not to exceed six patients as a principal permitted use in R-2 and

less restrictive zoning districts. The Zoning Administrator has recently interpreted the Code to permit family care homes for one or two mentally retarded persons in the single-family zoning districts. Although a home for more than two such persons has in the past been considered semi-institutional in nature and for that reason prohibited in single-family districts, current evidence and testimony are to the contrary.

It is recommended that a foster home or family home for not more than six persons be permitted as a principal use in R-1-D, R-1 and less restrictive zoning districts.

The maximum of six persons recommended would be in addition to the "caretaker," whether that be a single person, a couple, or a family with children. However, social agency representatives have stated that where there are "natural" children in the family, the number of foster children to be placed is decided in the light of the total number of children that will result.

As stated in the memorandum to the Commission, the staff believes it preferable to treat foster and family homes as a separate use for Planning Code purposes, rather than to include them within the definition of "family." Accordingly, a new subsection should be added to Section 201.1 ("Principal Uses Permitted, R-1-D Districts") to permit foster and family homes for not more than six persons as a principal use.

In the staff's judgment, the proposal is in accord with the modern trend of caring for the neglected, dependent and handicapped in a home setting wherever that is feasible. A need has been established for such homes in single-family areas; these areas can provide the type of environment most beneficial to persons placed in the homes. The social agencies concerned, as well as this Department and Commission, are interested in controlling licensing and placement in these homes so as to avoid invonvenience or nuiscance to the neighbors in addition to furthering the betterment of the persons placed. The social agencies are in the best position to judge and control the number of persons who will reside in the homes, and in their judgment there are some situations (although relatively few) where a total of five or six persons would be appropriate.

The intent of allowing foster and family homes in all neighborhoods of the City is to enable the need for this type of care to be fulfilled in a family-like atmosphere. The staff feels that this type of atmosphere can in fact be cheated, and in the event of any abuses in individual cases, we will work with the social agency concerned to remedy the situation. However, experience has indicated that abuses will be rare and it is in the interests of all concerned to correct them; the vast majority of homes will be compatible neighbors which are truly unobtrusive.

5. PROPOSED PLANNING CODE AMENDMENTS CONCERNING OCCUPANCY OF SINGLE FAMILY DWELLINGS (Under advisement from meeting of September 26, 1968).

In line with the request of President Brinton, Mr. Steele began his presentation of the proposed Planning Code Amendments concerning occupancy in single family dwellings. The basic text of his remarks is recorded below:

"Occupancy of single-family dwellings under the City Planning Code is limited by the concept of a 'family' as defined in the Code. The existing definition states basically that a 'family' is 'One (1) or more persons occupying the premises and living therein as a single and separate housekeeping unit.' The looseness and generality of this definition, and of some related Code provisions, have given rise to problems in interpretation and enforcement of the Planning Code. In the absence of clear Code authorization, it has proven difficult to establish effective limits on the size of a group that may legally occupy a single-family dwelling.

As a result of this inadequacy in the existing Code, periodic requests have been made for remedial action. Complaints have arisen from various neighborhoods that groups of persons -- students at local colleges, or working people or persons connected with an organization of some kind -- are exceeding the permitted occupancy, and that such activity is inconsistent with the character of the neighborhood and its single-family zoning classification. In some cases, the Department has agreed that these complaints were valid, but has been impeded from taking effective enforcement action. In general, a condition of uncertainty has existed as to what is legally-premitted occupancy of a single-family dwelling; clarification is required by way of Code amendment.

There is no doubt that excessive occupancy creates actual or potential adverse effects on a neighborhood -- too much noise, too much traffic on local streets, too many cars to park, and so forth; the threat of further intrusions and possible commercial encroachment; and ultimately, possible decline in property values and deterioration of the neighborhood.

Several years ago, Supervisor Boas introduced in the Board of Supervisors an amendment to the definition of 'family', intended to respond to the problems just described by limiting the number of unrelated residents that may constitute a single family. This amendment was referred to the Department of City Planning. Although discussions have been held with various interested parties, a comprehensive review of the many questions raised by this amendment could not be scheduled until recently because of work program priorities and personnel changes in the Department.

The Department staff believes, based on its study of this matter, that the Planning Code needs amendment in order to set a definite limit on single-family occupancy. The basic objective of such a limit would be to control the intensity of use in single-family dwellings, thereby affecting the amount of noise, traffic generation, parking demand, and other land use effects produced. Clearly this objective is a proper one justifying the employment of land use controls. The question is then raised, what is the most appropriate method of control to achieve it?

A number of possible methods have been considered, including controls on the ratio of persons to living space; the requirement of additional parking spaces, dependent on the number of residents; and provision for conditional use review by the Planning Commission in various situations. A decision has been made, however, that limiting the total number of unrelated persons in a dwelling is the preferable method. For purposes of enforcement and administration, it is most essential that the method of control be simple and direct, and this consideration must outweigh the theoretical superiority of more refined solutions.

Any limitation on the number of unrelated persons must recognize certain realities. A complete prohibition on occupancy of this type would be undesirable in that it would not reflect some legitimate and appropriate living arrangements, and for this reason, could well be invalid legally. A city, especially one as large and varied as San Francisco, must allow for some flexibility in living accommodations even within its single-family zoning districts. The issue is therefore not one of complete prohibition but rather of reasonable but effective limitation to curb abuses and excesses.

Existing Provisions:

The Planning Code defines a 'family' basically as 'one (1) or more persons occupying the premises and living therein as a single and separate housekeeping unit.' Through the definitions of 'dwelling' and 'dwelling unit,' this is related to the Code provisions governing permittes used in R-1-D and less restrictive zoning districts. Thus, a 'one-family detached dwelling' is listed as a principal permitted use in R-1-D districts.

Based on the existing Code provisions, several administrative interpretations have been developed. Where occupancy is by unrelated persons, a maximum of five such persons (exclusive of servants) is permitted. This limit is based primarily on the definition of 'boarding house' (permitted only in R-3 and less restrictive districts) in terms of six or more persons. By a somewhat similar interpretation, up to five roomers or boarders

are permitted, but only when accessory to a 'related'family. Where servants reside in the dwelling, they must be bona fide and full-time employees, and their number must be reasonable in relation to the circumstances.

Proposed Amendments:

It is recommended that a 'family' be defined as a group of persons living as a single housekeeping unit, where either: 1) All members of the group (aside from servants) are related by blood, marriage or adoption; or 2) The group does not exceed five persons. In addition, with a 'related' group only, a maximum of three roomers or boarders should be permitted.

Bona fide domestic servants can be considered part of a 'family' even though unrelated to the primary group. However, if the primary group is itself unrelated, the permitted total (of five) must include any servants.

Roomers or boarders are permitted only with a 'related' group constituting a family. It is neither necessary nor appropriate to allow roomers in addition to unrelated persons -- in effect that would be allowing up to eight unrelated persons instead of five.

Code Provisions to Be Amended:

The full text of the proposed changes is set forth in the draft resolution. A brief description of the reasons for amending each particular section is as follows:

The definition of 'family' (Section 102.8) is amended to incorporate the basic limitations previously described.

The accessory use provisions for dwellings (Section 114) are amended to remove references to roomers and boarders, which will now be treated under the definition of family in Section 102.8. It is felt that all single-family occupancy of a residential nature should be included in the definition of family, and language is added to Section 114 to reflect this. Thus, Section 114 as amended would be pertinent only with reference to commercial and semi-commercial uses accessory to dwellings.

The listing of one-family and two-family dwellings as principal uses in R-1-D, R-1 and R-2 districts (Sections 201.1., 202.1, 203.1) is amended to add language specifically relating the occupancy of such dwellings to the definitions of dwelling unit and family. These cross-references will be extremely helpful and pertinent in

administering the Planning Code. Also, the listing of one-family dwellings as principal uses in R-1-D and R-1 districts is amended to add a prohibition on rental of rooms with independent outside access; this is an existing prohibition which would be removed from Section 114.

The listing of boarding house as a principal use in R-3 districts (Section 204.1) is amended to add the accommodation of four or more roomers or boarders. This will remedy a 'gap' that would otherwise exist between the maximum of three roomers to be permitted under the definition of family in R-1-D districts, and the six or more persons constituting a boarding house as defined in Section 102.2.

In the opinion of the staff, based on its study of the problems and factors involved, the Planning Code should be amended to impose reasonable limits on the permitted occupancy of single-family dwellings. Such limits must take into account the legitimate desires of residents of single-family neighborhoods for protection against excessive occupancy and actual or potential abuses flowing therefrom. The limits must also consider the continuing need in San Francisco for single-family residential areas as part of a total balanced housing supply. At the same time, the Planning Code must recognize the existence of and need for varied kinds of living accommodations in areas zoned for single-family use -- unrelated persons who desire to share ownership or occupancy of homes in these areas should have the option of doing so within limits, and some rental of rooms should be allowed.

The limit of <u>five</u> recommended for occupancy by unrelated persons would replace the existing limit of five set by administrative interpretation. However, this new Planning Code limit would be a stronger one by virtue of being imposed by law rather than interpretation. Furthermore, the new limit would be more stringent -- it would set a maximum of five persons <u>total</u>, whereas the present interpretation leaves open the possibility that servants and related persons could reside in the dwelling <u>in addition to</u> the five unrelated persons.

Although some may feel that even the new, more stringent limit of five unrelated persons is too permissive, the staff believes that in this area of regulation some leeway is necessary. Given the fact that the average size of all families in single-family neighborhoods in San Francisco is approximately three, an upper limit of five seems to allow desirable flexibility. Of course, this would be a maximum figure and would not be reached in all or even a majority of cases. Also, in those areas where private

covenants may properly be more restrictive than a zoning ordinance, which must apply equally and uniformly throughout the City. (It should be noted, however, that the City does not have authority to create or to enforce such private covenants.)

With respect to roomers, the recommended maximum of three is less than the proposed maximum of five for unrelated persons; this differential is proper because the roomers would be in addition to the family permanently occupying the dwelling. The maximum of three would provide desirable flexibility while avoiding excessive occupancy.

President Brinton thanked Mr. Steele for his presentation of these two related items, and then turned to the audience to ask any interested parties to please step forward and state as briefly as possible their comments on the proposed amendments.

Tony Calaman, representing the Freedom for Adoptive Children Organization, began his remarks by stating that foster homes are a big business; so big, in fact, that foster homes cost California taxpayers $250,000,000 last year. In Mr. Calaman's opinion, foster homes are not needed. What has happened, he explained, is that Parkinson's Law is at work in the bureaucratic system of our government. Mr. Calaman stressed that a foster child enters the world with a stigma on his head as a result of the bureaucratic treatment of this problem. The alternative to the system, he stressed, is to open up homes to children so that kids can be "adopted out" to these homes, which would be open on a voluntary basis.

At this point, Mr. Jacobs stressed that a foster home as classified by the proposed code amendments is that type of home permitted in an R-1, R-1-D or less restrictive zone with no more than six mentally-handicapped persons permitted in such a home.

Alvin Pelavin, representing the San Francisco Coordinating Council on Mental Retardation, stated that he was pleased with the staff's recommendations. Furthermore, he stated, he thinks the definition of foster care and family care homes is a good one and should be retained as proposed. Mr. Pelavin stated that the staff of his organization is on hand to answer any questions that the Commissioners might wish to consider.

Harold Clinger, President of the Recreation Center for the Handicapped, recommended that family care homes are superior in the treatment and care of the mentally retarded to the facilities of the typical mental institution. The handicapped would benefit from the proposed amendments to the Planning Code should they be adopted.

The next speaker was Dean C. Julian Bartlett of the Grace Cathedral. Dean Bartlett stated that it is well known that so-called mentally retarded people can and do function well when allowed to participate through the normal channels of society. He stressed that these people can be integrated with society and that they can make significant contributions if given the opportunity. Dean Bartlett then pointed out that objections raised at the last meeting, namely, that people of this type living in residential areas would constitute commercial activity, and that people of this type would adversely affect property values, have little bearing when measured against the desires and responsibility of all of society. For example, there is no law against a family having as many children as possible and, therefore, why should there be a law against people taking children into their homes, of whatever type these children may be. Dean Bartlett also stated that mentally retarded people are the responsibility of everyone in society, and that there is no reason why these people should be relegated to particular parts of the city only.

Dr. Charles Agler, Chief of the Mental Retardation Program of the City and County of San Francisco, expressed his support for the staff recommendations. Dr. Agler stated there is no cause for alarm in these recommendations, for upon close examination, one can find that already 80% of mentally retarded people are in single-family neighborhoods at the present. Furthermore, most foster and family care homes now in operation are working quite satisfactorily.

Ernest Lotti, Public Affairs Commissioner of the ARC, said that he wanted to agree wholeheartedly with the staff recommendations. Mr. Lotti stated that the matter of residence by area is not the point, for upon examination of the facts, one can find that normal kids cause more trouble than retarded kids. He also stated that retarded kids need places to go; otherwise, those who want to take care of such kids would be deprived of the opportunity.

Mrs. Rosemary French, a housewife, and speaking on behalf of the National Association of Social Workers, expressed her support for the staff recommendations. and stated that the happiness of families depends on having children in residence.

Mrs. Joy Bianci, representing the Helpers of the Mentally Retarded, stated that a definition of mentally retarded persons should not be regarded unjustly, that is, the physical growth of such a person occurs out of line with the mental growth. At this point in her presentation, Mrs. Bianci introduced several mentally retarded visitors she brought along. These persons gave their ages and told what they had done recently. Due to the lateness of the hour, not all of Mrs. Bianci's visitors could be introduced to the Commission and the audience.

Mrs. Hill, a "caretaker" of six retarded children, stated that such children are well behaved and that they have good minds. She stressed that these children enjoy normal activities and that they will not harm anyone. Mrs. Hill expressed her enjoyment of the "caretaker" roll which she plays.

George Bangs, who stated that he has been handicapped all his life, said that this staff recommendation would allow a breakdown of existing provisions built into R-1 and R-1-D areas. In short, it would establish commercial activities in these areas with nothing done about increased parking requirements. He regretted that the staff recommendations did not include provisions for increased parking, and concluded his statement by saying that he was strictly against the staff recommendation.

Mr. Gibbons, a board member of the Miraloma Improvement Association, stated his opposition to the staff recommendations, even if the proposed recommendations became legislation susceptible to regulation. He cited as an example that a contractor in the area in which he lives violated City codes recently. Mr. Gibbons stated that the intention of the existing codes was and is to prevent business from encroaching upon residential areas. If the situation should change, he felt there would be a possible decrease in property values, which he wouldn't want to happen.

Oscar Fisher, President of the Lakeshore Acres Improvement Council, and a member of the West of Twin Peaks Central Council, stated that a point brought out at a September 26 hearing, i.e., that too much was left to interpretation, was a valid point to be made. In other words, Mr. Fisher stated, if there is a change to be made, the Code should spell out succintly and clearly those changes. Mr. Fisher went on to say that there is too much left to talk about, so that any action by the Commission on this day probably would be premature. Mr. Fisher reported that he had given a detailed pres entation of the staff recommendations to both organizations to which he belongs. In each presentation he felt that he was fair to both sides of the question. It was unanimous in the meetings of both organizations that there was opposition to the presence of mentally retarded persons in R-1 or R-1-D districts. Mr. Fisher went on to say that he believes there is too much lumped together in the staff recommendations. Perhaps he could accept four persons of mentally handicapped status in a home, but, in any case, the mixing of handicapped with normal children is not correct. Furthermore, he stated, at the last meeting, four mentally handicapped persons were considered as the limit, so that he questioned why the limit should be raised to six persons 60 days later. Mr. Fisher concluded by saying that snap decisions should not take place now.

Mr. Jacobs responded to Mr. Fisher's question by stating that at the last meeting, no staff recommendations were presented. However, both four and six person limits were noted as alternatives, and after consultation with experts in the field and social agencies involved it was decided upon to choose six as the limit.

Mr. Fisher than added that if Mr. Steele and the staff have been speaking of a "proposed amendment," it must then mean that something now has been set, so that public opinion is not really contributory at this point.

Mr. Jacobs reiterated his earlier point that in coming to a set limit on the number of mentally handicapped persons who could reside in the home that

the staff had to rely on the assessment of professionals in the field to determine an appropriate number. These professionals felt that six is an outside or allowable number of such persons. Furthermore, it would be presumptuous of the Planning Department to assign a specific limit in such situations; rather the Department places a major reliance upon the advice and counsel of professionals in the field of mental health and mental retardation.

Commissioner Porter felt at this point that it would be helpful if the Commission and the audience could draw upon Mr. Pelavin's offer to seek advice from professional advisers who accompanied him to this meeting.

Hank Schoenlein, with the Department of Mental Hygiene, stepped forward to say that he and his department have made available professional services to neighborhoods which have asked for professional consultation on these and related matters. Mr. Schoenlein stated that the size of the house and the number of mentally retarded persons are related to one another. Additionally, room size is a critical factor. For example, a two or three bedroom home probably would not be able to handle six children or persons who are mentally retarded.

Commissioner Porter stated that this very kind of professional advice is most helpful; it shows that each case must be considered individually. She then asked Mr. Schoenlein how many cases involve the placement of six persons or children, who are mentally retarded, in a family care or foster home.

Mr. Schoenlein responded that it is unusual to have six such persons in a given home.

The next speaker was Dr. Stephen Silberstein, a psychiatrist with the De Witt State Hospital. Dr. Silberstein stated that he had read the minutes of the last meeting and had two comments to make: One, he assured the audience that a foster home is not a business, because there is little, if any, money involved in this kind of activity; and two, in regard to possible concern for disruption of neighborhoods where mentally retarded persons might be located, he stated that disturbances, if any, caused by even the most mentally retarded or handicapped persons, are rare.

Elmer Murray, Secretary-Treasurer of the Balboa Terrace Homes Association, lent his support to Mr. Fisher's statement and stated that he was fully authorized to to so by the association he is representing. Mr. Murray then asked Mr. Schoenlein to define the difference between a foster care and a family care home.

Mr. Schoenlein responded that these terms are generic terms, and that there is little difference between the two.

Mr. Murray then asked the question of whether such homes are not businesses. In any case, he felt that there should be a legal definition of this type of commercial activity.

Mrs. Thomas R. Best then rose from the audience and referred to specific pages of the Planning Code, stating that these sections guarantee what is and what is not permitted in R-1 and R-1-D districts. She stated strongly that the Planning Code should be upheld as it now stands. Furthermore, she felt that the grief of property owners matches that of mentally handicapped persons or their "caretakers." Mrs. Best stated that more extensive planning should be done so that R-1 and R-1-D areas should not be asked to carry the burdens suggested by the staff recommendations.

Reverend John Duffy, representing the San Francisco Council of Churches, stated the support of his organization for the staff recommendations.

President Brinton then called for the question on each item before the Commission. Commissioner Wight moved, and Commissioner Elliott seconded, to accept the staff recommendations on proposed Planning Code amendments concerning foster homes and family care homes. The vote of the Commission was 4 - 0.

Before moving to consider proposed amendments of the City Planning Code concerning the definition of "family" as it pertains to regulations governing occupancy of single family dwellings, Commissioner Porter asked Mr. Steele why the definition of "family" governing occupancy of single family dwellings should be restricted to five persons and the exclusion of domestic help, when the number of persons allowed in foster and family care homes was set at six persons. Mr. Steele responded that the limit of five persons was proposed for single family dwellings as opposed to six for family and foster care homes in light of preventing congestion of too many roomers in the former amendment.

Mr. Fisher rose to ask if the proposed amendment before the Commission was designed to clarify a vague wording in the Code. President Brinton stated that it was. Granted this clarification of the Code, Mr. Fisher stated his opposition to this proposed amendment, because the addition of roomers to an R-1 or R-1-D district would bring additional vehicles to these areas, creating conditions similar to those of high-density areas. In short, the proposed amendment would manufacture problems.

Mr. Jacobs stated that the proposed amendment would not serve to manufacture problems, but in fact would serve to minimize the problem, hopefully.

Allan Mitchum, of the Jordan Park Improvement Association, stated that he could go along with only three roomers, but not five.

Commissioner Porter then asked if "bootleg" apartments can not be abandoned or abated. She asked if there was not a two-year period to legalize these "mother-in-law" arrangements from 1961 through 1963. Mr. Steele answered that Mrs. Porter was correct in both her points, but he also emphasized that the Department is not an enforcement agency.

President Brinton then called for the question on the matter of the draft resolution before the Commission. Commissioner Elliott moved, and Vice President Porter seconded, to accept the proposed amendments of the City Planning Code concerning definition of "family" as it would pertain to regulations governing occupancy of single family dwellings. The Commission vote was unanimous in approval of the draft resolution.

President Brinton adjourned the meeting at 5:35 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

R. Bruce Anderson
Acting Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, December 5, 1968.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, December 5, 1968 at 2:15 P.M. in Room 282, City Hall.

PRESENT: William M. Brinton, President; Mrs. Charles B. Porter, Vice President; Virgil L. Elliott, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Jr., James S. Kearney, Walter S. Newman, and Walter W. Wight, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: None

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation; Wayne Rieke, Planner IV-Zoning; Robert Frank, Planner II; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner and Scott Blakey represented the San Francisco Chronicle.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Kearney, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meeting of October 10, 1968, be approved as submitted.

CURRENT MATTERS

The Director reported that the Social Services and Streets and Transportation Committees of the Board of Supervisors, meeting jointly on Tuesday, had voted unanimously to approve plans for the combined housing and parking facility to be located at Mission and Bartlett Streets. This matter will be before the full Board next Monday.

The Director recommended that he be authorized to pay a bill in the amount of $34,500 which had been submitted by John S. Bolles and Associates, consultants for the Northern Waterfront Development Study. After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that this payment be authorized.

It was recommended by the Director that the Commission's regular meeting scheduled for December 26, 1968, be cancelled. Subsequently, it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that this meeting be cancelled.

The Director advised the Commission that the West Bay Rapid Transit District had published a report recommending that three steps be taken toward achieving rapid transit service for residents of the Peninsula. The first step would involve upgrading of commuter bus service on the Peninsula; the second step would involve construction of a compatible extension of the BART system to San Francisco International Airport; and the third step would involve extension of the BART system from the Airport to San Jose. The Director remarked that these proposals were in general conformity with the transit plans which had been recommended by the City Planning Commission.

Commissioner Fleishhacker felt that the Department of City Planning should be directly responsible for the preparation of transit plans which would affect the Airport or any other municipally owned facility. The Director agreed.

CU68.31 Fairmont Hotel, block bounded by Mason, California, Powell and Sacramento Streets.
Request for expansion of existing hotel by addition of a 408-room tower exceeding 160 feet in height.

Marvin D. Morgenstein, representing the Fairmont Hotel, requested that hearing of this matter be postponed for 90 days.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Elliott, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that hearing of this matter be postponed until the meeting of March 6, 1969.

ZM68.32 3537 and 3543-45 Jennings Street, northeast corner at Meade Avenue.
R-1 to an R-2 District.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the applicant had requested reclassification of the property from R-1 to R-2 to permit one of the two lots to be used as a nursing home for up to six patients. If the application were approved, the existing residence would be remodeled to make it suitable for this use.

Mrs. Renna Holland, the applicant, stated that she is a nurse; and she hoped to convert her home into a convalescent hospital so that she could care for welfare patients on the site. She stated that she had had a great deal of experience working with welfare patients; and she wanted to continue to help needy people.

Commissioner Porter asked if plans for the proposed facility had been approved by the State Department of Public Health. Mrs. Holland stated that she had discussed her plans with the Welfare Department; however, she had planned to defer discussions with the State Department of Public Health until action had been taken on the subject application by the Commission.

Mr. Steele recommended disapproval of the subject application. He noted that Meade Avenue, while not developed, is a reasonable and appropriate boundary between the existing single family development north of Meade Avenue and vacant R-2 properties to the south. Furthermore, there appeared to be no public need or benefit to be derived from the requested extension of the R-2 district into the subject R-1 district.

President Brinton noted that the City Planning Code requires applicants for convalescent homes to demonstrate the need for such facilities in the locations proposed; and, since the Commission had already approved a 300 bed convalescent hospital on property located south of Meade Avenue in the subject neighborhood, he questioned whether the facility proposed would actually be needed.

Commissioner Kearney asked Mrs. Holland what her monthly patient charge would be. Mrs. Holland replied that she would charge $170 or $180 per month per patient.

Commissioner Kearney recalled that subsequently higher rates had been proposed by the sponsors of the 300-bed convalescent hospital which had been approved for the property located on the other side of Meade Avenue. Because there is a need for lower priced convalescent beds in San Francisco, and because the Commission had already approved a convalescent hospital for property located in the immediate vicinity of the subject site, he felt that the Commission should look on the present application more favorably.

Commissioner Porter noted that the State Department of Public Health will establish various standards which must be met before the proposed facility could be licensed, including requirements for the number of employees which must be hired. As a result of such stipulations, it might become necessary for the applicant to charge higher rates than those presently proposed. She noted that most of the convalescent facilities which have recently been proposed were quite large in scale; and she assumed that economics had a great deal to do with this phenomenon.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if any other property owners in the subject neighborhood had addressed comments on the proposal to the Department of City Planning. Mr. Steele replied in the negative.

Mrs. Holland stated that all of her neighbors had expressed a willingness to send notes to the Commission in support of the application; however, she had been advised by the staff of the Department of City Planning that submission of such petitions would not be necessary.

The Director stated that the staff was fully aware of and sympathetic to the need for facilities of the type proposed; however, if the application were to be approved, it might invite further future encroachment of R-2 zoning into an existing R-1 district. In any case, from the planning standpoint, he felt that approval of the subject application would have only a marginal affect on the neighborhood.

President Brinton remarked that it would be in the best interest of the applicant, also, to obtain a clearer picture of how these standards set by the State would affect her operating expenses and her ability to compete with the larger convalescent hospital which would be constructed on the south side of Meade Avenue.

Mrs. Holland stated that she is presently charging only $80 or $90 a month per patient. The higher rate which she had proposed, ranging from $180 to $190, had been recommended by the Welfare Department; and she was certain that those rates would be adequate to pay for any expenses which she might incur by operating the proposed facility.

Commissioner Newman stated that he was sympathetic with Mrs. Holland's request; however, he felt that it would be helpful to the Commission if letters could be obtained from the Welfare Department and from the Department of Public Health testifying to the need for and the economic viability of the proposed facility.

Mrs. Holland stated that Mrs. Ann Cole, an employee of the Welfare Department, had called Mr. Rieke of the staff of the Department of City Planning to verify the need for the proposed facility.

After further discussion, President Brinton suggested that it might be desirable to take the subject application under advisement so that letters could be obtained from the Social Services Department and from the State Department of Public Health commenting on the questions of need and economic viability.

Commissioner Fleishhacker suggested that the applicant should also be requested to obtain letters from other property owners in the subject neighborhood indicating their reaction to her proposal.

Subsequently, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the subject application be taken under advisement until the meeting of December 12, 1968.

ZM68.24 Harrison Street, West line, between 100 feet and 150 North of Ripley Street

R-1 to an R-3 District

The Secretary read a telegram which had been received from Lawrence Buttwinnick, President of the Bernal Heights Association, requesting that both the subject application and application ZM68.25 be postponed for one month to allow further time for study.

Ed Kenney, representing the owner of the subject property, remarked that this matter should have been scheduled for hearing before the Commission in November; however, because of the Commission's lengthy agenda at that time, the hearing was postponed until December 5. Under the circumstances, he felt that ample time had been made available to other residents of the neighborhood to study the application.

President Brinton indicated that the Commission would proceed with the hearing as scheduled, reserving a decision as to whether final action would be taken on the application at the conclusion at the present hearing.

Mr. Steele referred to land-use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He indicated that the applicant's proposal would involve addition of the eastern 30 feet of the subject property to the rear of the lot on the northwest corner of Ripley and Harrison Streets in order to increase the size of that lot to 30 feet by 150 feet. A new four-unit apartment house would then be constructed to the rear of the existing duplex on that lot. The fifth garage proposed in that four-unit building would be used to satisfy the parking requirements for a third unit proposed to be added at 162 Ripley Street. No construction was presently anticipated on the western 80 feet of the subject property. However, if the application were approved, that lot could subsequently be developed either as a part of the Ripley Street property or as an independent development with access from Harrison Street over a 20 foot easement which was being proposed across the rear yard of the proposed new apartment house.

Mr. Kenney stated that it was his opinion that the subject neighborhood is not conducive to single family dwellings because of the age and condition of the neighborhood; furthermore, because of the cost of the land, apartment houses would seem to be a more sensible investment than single family homes. He stated that he was presently engaged in the construction of a six-unit apartment building on Ripley Street; and, judging from the number of inquiries which he had received, he felt that it was obvious that there is a great demand for apartments in this area. He remarked that there are a number of vacant R-1 properties on Ripley Street whose owners might wish to construct apartment buildings if their properties could be rezoned; however, he emphasized that approval of the subject application would not commit the Commission to any further zone changes in the neighborhood. In conclusion, Mr. Kenney remarked that there has been some talk of renewing the subject neighborhood through the redevelopment process; however, he urged the Commission to give property owners in the area the opportunity to renew the area themselves by approving requests for reclassification which would make construction of new buildings more economically feasible.

James Rabb, owner of the six-unit apartment building which is presently being constructed on Ripley Street, stated that he had received at least 50 telephone calls from people wondering about the availability of apartments in his building. This seemed to him a clear indication that there is a need for the type of apartments proposed by the present applicant.

Elizabeth Egger, representing the Bernal Heights Association, submitted petitions which had been signed by the owners of several parcels of property in the area protesting the reclassification of properties in the vicinity of Ripley Street from R-1 to R-3. If R-3 apartment buildings were to be constructed on Ripley Street, the views from at least five properties located on Waltham Street would be affected; and the value of those view properties would be decreased. Furthermore, she felt that there is a greater need for single family homes in San Francisco than for apartment buildings.

Richard C. Beggs, 3290 Harrison Street, asked if development of the subject properties with apartment houses would eventually affect the theoretical extension of Harrison Street. Mr. Kenney replied in the affirmative.

In that case, Mr. Beggs stated that he did not favor the proposal to reclassify the properties. He stated that the subject portion of Harrison Street is already used to some extent like a "racetrack"; and he felt that removal of the existing cul-de-sac would make this situation worse.

Another resident of the neighborhood felt that the single family character of the neighborhood should not be disturbed any more than it has been disturbed already.

Mr. Beggs asked if it would be possible to review the architectural plans for the proposed buildings. He remarked that most of the new R-3 apartment houses being built are of a pink stucco and frame aluminum "ticky-tacky" style; however, he felt that it was possible that the buildings proposed by the applicant might be an asset to the neighborhood.

The Director advised Mr. Beggs that the Commission had no authority to set conditions regarding building plans when acting on a zoning reclassification as opposed to a conditional use request.

Mr. Kenney remarked that the dead-end portion of Harrison Street is presently a washed-out, blighted area that no one ever uses; and he indicated that he and other residents of the neighborhood had hoped for years that the street would be improved.

The Director noted that the Bernal Heights Association had prepared a plan for their neighborhood which had called for the construction of a stepwalk area in the unimproved portion of Harrison Street; and he noted that that plan had been reviewed by the City Planning Commission.

Landis Eberson, 73 Walthan Street, remarked that a question regarding the zoning of the area between Harrison and Alabama Streets had arisen several years ago; and, at that time, property owners in the area had decided that the R-1 zoning designation should be retained. He advised the Commission that most of the property owners in the area still felt that the area should remain R-1.

Mr. Steele recommended that the subject application be disapproved. He stated that there appeared to be no public need for additional land to be zoned R-3 when considerable land so zoned on Ripley Street in the subject neighborhood is vacant or undeveloped. In addition, he felt that the proposed extension of the R-3 zone would be inappropriate in view of the surrounding R-1 and R-2 areas; and he believed that the requested rezoning could be detrimental to existing developments in the adjacent single family areas. In conclusion, he submitted a draft resolution of disapproval for consideration by the Commission and recommended its adoption.

Mr. Kenney stated that he had been advised by the Director of Public Works that the dead-end portion of Harrison Street would have to be improved if the subject properties were to be developed. However, only 150 feet of the roadway would have to be so improved; and the remainder could be developed as a cul-de-sac. He emphasized that the R-3 zoning standards do not permit high density development; and, if property owners were willing to spend money for developments in accordance with those standards, he felt that they should be encouraged by the City Planning Commission.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Kearney, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6306 and that the subject application be disapproved.

ZM68.25 162 and 166 Ripley Street, south line, 200 feet west of Alabama Street. R-1 to an R-3 District.

Mr. Steele stated that the applicant had requested reclassification of the subject property from R-1 to R-3 in order to convert the existing two-floor over garage duplex to three-dwelling units by adding a dwelling unit on a new third floor. In addition, the adjacent one-family dwelling would be replaced with a new three-unit apartment house.

Ed Kenney, the applicant, noted that the subject two-family building already has nonconforming use status under its present R-1 zoning classification; however, if the subject application were approved, that duplex would obtain legal status. In addition to adding a third unit to that building, his clients proposed to demolish a single-family home on the adjacent lot and to construct a new apartment building. Neither of the proposed construction projects would affect the views from properties located higher on the hill; and he felt that the new construction would be an asset to the neighborhood.

James Rabb stated that his new six-unit apartment building is located only 20 feet away from the subject site; and he indicated that he had no objection to the applicant's proposal.

Mr. Eberson, 73 Waltham Street, stated that his property is located immediately behind the subject lots. If that property were reclassified to R-3, any new building constructed on the site would be allowed to reach a height of

40 feet; and he believed that a building that tall would block the view from his property. In any case, he was opposed to changing the single-family zoning of the neighborhood.

Mrs. Egger, 79 Waltham Street, felt that the addition of a third unit to the existing duplex located on one of the subject lots would result in an ugly box-like building. She stated that she had no objection to the six-unit building which is presently being constructed on Ripley Street, because that building sits on a declivity which renders it no taller than the adjacent one-story building; however, she did object to construction of any buildings which would tower above others in the neighborhood. She felt that the construction proposed by the applicant on the subject lots would devaluate her view property; and, for that reason, she asked that the application be disapproved.

Mr. Beggs, 3290 Harrison Street, stated that he was generally against any proposal to reclassify any of the R-1 properties in the subject neighborhood to R-3.

Mr. Steele recommended disapproval of the subject application. He stated that there appeared to be no public need or benefit to be derived from the extension of the R-3 zone since the existing R-3 zone contains some vacant land as well as some underdeveloped property. Furthermore, he believed that such an extension would be inappropriate as well as premature and that it could have a detrimental affect on the adjacent R-1 and R-2 areas. He distributed copies of the draft resolution of disapproval which he had prepared and recommended its adoption.

Mr. Kenney remarked that the zoning classification assigned to the subject neighborhood seven or eight years ago was supposed to have promoted property improvements in the area; however, he felt that it was obvious that that end had not been achieved. Nevertheless, property owners were now willing to improve their properties by constructing R-3 apartment buildings; and he felt that any requested change of zoning should be approved to give them encouragement. If the Commission were willing to take the subject application under advisement, he would be prepared to meet with the Bernal Heights Association to discuss the projects which were being proposed by his clients; and, if necessary, he believed that the buildings could be redesigned to meet any objections raised by residents of the area.

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that during discussion of the previous case (ZM68.24) Mr. Kenney had stated that single-family homes are not being constructed on R-1 properties in the subject neighborhood because the properties are too expensive. It seemed to him, however, that the properties might me too expensive because people expect that they might be reclassified to R-3. He indicated that he supported the recommendation of the staff; and he moved that the subject application be disapproved. This motion was seconded by Commissioner Porter.

When the question was called, the Commission voted unanimously to adopt the draft resolution as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6307 and to disapprove the subject application.

ZM68.28 Octavia Street, northwest corner of Fell Street.
R-4 to a C-2 District.

Ed Kenney, representing the applicant, noted that his client had previously sought permission from the Commission to construct a convalescent hospital on the site; however, that project had been abandoned. Subsequently, his client had conferred with the Redevelopment Agency about the possibility of developing the property to accommodate a business which would be required to relocate from Western Addition Redevelopment Project Area A-2. Two possible tenants were presently being considered; however, no firm decision had yet been made. Therefore, he requested that hearing of the subject application be postponed until the requirements of a specific tenant could be represented.

Mr. Steele noted that the Commission would not have authority to make its approval of the subject application conditional upon the property being put to a specific use; therefore, he felt that the Commission should proceed with the hearing as scheduled, directing its attention to the general category of uses which would be permitted in the requested C-2 district.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that the applicant's request be honored and that hearing of this matter be postponed indefinitely.

ZM68.31 1300 Egbert Avenue, northwest corner at Engle Street.
R-1 to an M-1 District.

Mr. Steele referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property, noting that all other property in the subject block is already zoned M-1. He stated that the applicant had requested reclassification of the subject parcel so that it could be merged with the adjacent M-1 properties to provide a larger site which could be sold to a trucking firm for a new warehouse building.

Lewis Maldonado, representing the applicant, stated that the application had been filed because of the request of a prospective purchaser who wished to use the subject site in conjunction with adjacent properties for a new warehouse.

Fred Peeters, representing the Peeters Transportation Company, confirmed that his firm wished to construct a new warehouse on the site if the requested reclassification were to be approved.

Commissioner Elliott asked about the height of the proposed warehouse. Mr. Peeters replied that the warehouse would have a height of 26 feet.

No one was present to speak in opposition to the application.

Mr. Steele recommended approval of the subject application. He remarked that it is the last remaining parcel of land zoned for residential use within the subject block; and he saw no reason why the property should not be developed as an industrial use while still providing the required amenities for the nearby residential area. Furthermore, he felt that reclassification of the property need not interfere with the effectuation of the recommendations included within the South Bayshore Plan. However, in order to assure the compatibility of the new industrial development with the adjacent neighborhood, he also recommended adoption of a resolution expressing the Commission's intention of exercising its discretionary authority to review all permit applications for development of the site.

President Brinton asked if the applicants were aware of the significance of the Commission's discretionary authority. Mr. Peeters replied in the affirmative.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Kearney, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6308 be adopted and that the subject application be approved.

Subsequently, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Kearney, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6309 be adopted and that the Commission establish a policy of reviewing under its discretionary authority all permit applications for development of the northwest corner of Egbert Avenue and Engle Street.

ZM68.33 2031 Lane Street, northeast corner of Van Dyke Avenue.
R-1 to an C-2 District.

Mr. Steele referred to land-use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He noted that the corner lot is presently vacant and that the adjacent lot is occupied by a single-family dwelling; he indicated that the applicant had proposed to use the existing building for a nursing home on a temporary basis until a new nursing home could be built on the vacant lot.

Mrs. Alice Trapani, agent for the owners of the subject properties, stated that her clients had received an offer for their property contingent upon approval of the requested zone change. She noted that properties along Third Street in the immediate vicinity are already zoned for and developed with commercial uses.

President Brinton, noting that nursing homes would be allowed in less intensive zoning districts, asked why a C-2 zone was being proposed. Mr. Steele replied that the only adjacent zone in which nursing homes would be permitted was the C-2 district along Third Street; reclassification of the property to any other zoning classification would involve "spot zoning."

Thomas Banducchi, 1543 Underwood Street, stated that he had nothing against nursing homes, however, he did not feel that the subject site would be suitable for such an operation. He noted that the property had been zoned R-1 only a few years ago; and it was his opinion that that zoning should be retained.

Another resident of the subject neighborhood, understanding that the applicant proposed to construct a non-residential building on the corner lot, objected to the reclassification. She noted that all other buildings in the subject block are single-family homes; and she felt that that pattern should not be changed.

Mr. Steele recommended that the subject application be approved. He remarked that the property is located so as to face existing commercially zoned areas; and he felt that the requested extension of the C-2 zone would be appropriate and timely. It seemed to him that use of the property for a small convalescent hospital would be appropriate and desirable as well as compatible with the adjacent residential commercial developments. In conclusion, he noted that the subject property, for all intents and purposes, fronts on Third Street, which is a major C-2 commercial street within the subject neighborhood. Mr. Banducchi felt that the proposed nursing home would be better located in the existing commercial district than on the subject corner which is presently zoned for residential use. Furthermore, if the zoning of the subject property were changed as requested, the owners could use the site for commercial purposes other than the nursing home which had been proposed.

Commissioner Porter asked Mr. Steele if he felt that any of the uses which would be permitted in the C-a zone might be detrimental to the subject neighborhood. Mr. Steele replied that use of the subject properties for some of the activities permitted in a C-2 district might possibly have a detrimental affect on the neighborhood because of the property's close proximity to adjacent buildings; however, since the subject property, for all practical purposes, fronts on Third Street, he felt that approval of the requested extension of the C-2 zone would be reasonable.

Commissioner Kearney, emphasizing that all other properties in the subject block are zoned R-1, felt that it would not be wise to change the zoning of the subject lots.

After further discussion, Commissioner Fleishhacker moved that the subject application be approved. He agreed with the staff that the subject property is really more related to Third Street than to the adjacent residential area;, and he did not feel that the requested zone change would substantially change the character of the subject block. This motion was seconded by Commissioner Elliott.

When the question was called, Commissioners Elliott, Fleishhacker, and Wight voted "aye"; Commissioners Brinton, Kearney, Newman and Porter voted "no". The motion therefore failed for want of a majority.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

Subsequently, it was moved by Commissioner Newman, seconded by Commissioner Kearney, and carried 4 to 3 that Resolution No. 6310 be adopted and that the subject application be disapproved. Commissioners Brinton, Kearney, Newman and Porter voted "aye"; Commissioners Elliott, Fleishhacker and Wight voted "no".

ZM68.34 615-845 Bosworth Street; 121 Brompton Avenue; and 709-721 Chilton Street.
R-1 and R-2 to an R-3 District.

Mr. Steele stated that this application had been initiated by the City Planning Commission in light of the pending application (ZM68.26) for the reclassification of the south side of Bosworth Street west of Chilton Avenue from R-1 to R-3 and because of recent and pending capital improvements in the subject neighborhood. Referring to land-use and zoning maps, he described the subject properties.

Mrs. Thelma Phipps, representing the Glen Park Property Owners Association, stated that residents of the neighborhood had been advised that the north side of Bosworth Street would be landscaped as permanent open space; and she wondered if the proposed reclassification of properties on the south side of Bosworth Street would affect in any way the landscaping on the north side of the street.

Mr. Steele replied in the negative and indicated that it was his understanding that the landscaping project had already been put out for bid.

No one was present to speak in opposition to the application.

Mr. Steele recommended approval of the application. In formulating its recommendation, the staff of the Department of City Planning had considered the widening of Bosworth Street and the creation of considerable open space on the north side of Bosworth Street as well as the impending development of the BART Station near the intersection of Diamond and Bosworth Streets. Furthermore, given the topography of the area, he felt that R-3 development of the subject properties would be compatible with the R-1 district to the south. He remarked that Bosworth Street itself is a major traffic artery of the city; and, with the construction of the new BART station at Diamond Street, he felt that development of additional apartment units along Bosworth Street would be desirable.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Elliott, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6311 be adopted and that the subject application by approved.

ZM68.26 901 to 943 Bosworth Street, south side, between Hamerton Avenue extended and Chilton Street.
R-1 to an R-3 District.

CU68.30 901 to 943 Bosworth Street, south side, between Hamerton Avenue extended and Chilton Avenue.
Request for a 216 bed convalescent hospital in an R-3 district.

Mr. Steele referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property. He stated that the request for reclassification of the property from R-1 to R-3 had been filed so that the proposed development of a 224-bed convalescent hospital on the site could be considered by the Commission. He indicated that the proposed hospital would have a basement garage, main floor, and four nursing floors, rising to a height of 65 feet above Bosworth Street. If approved, the hospital would be the tallest building in the neighborhood, rising as high above Bosworth Street as the houses to the rear of the parcel which front on Chilton and Hamerton Streets; however, because of the topography of the site, and because the buildings to the rear do not have windows facing north, the height of the proposed convalescent hospital would not have any substantial effect on views presently enjoyed from existing dwellings in the neighborhood. While the City Planning Code would allow 70% coverage of the site, the plan submitted by the applicants had indicated that only 50.8% of the site would actually be covered by the proposed building.

Thomas Hsieh, architect for the applicant, described the plans which he had prepared for the proposed building, noting particularly the setbacks which he had achieved at the ground floor and second floor level and the landscaping proposed for these and other areas of the site. He felt that the building would add to the over-all quality of the area and that it would serve residents of the neighborhood well.

Commissioner Porter asked how many parking spaces would be provided for the proposed facility. Mr. Hsieh replied that the facility would have 42 parking spaces -- a ratio of one parking space for every five beds.

President Brinton asked how many employees would be hired by the convalescent hospital. Mr. Hsieh replied that an average of 30 employees would be on the site at any one time.

The Secretary read a petition which had been signed by a large number of residents and property owners from the Glen Park District in support of the subject applications.

Roy Flamm, representing the Glen Park Forum, advised the Commission that his organization had established a policy of supporting increased usage of property in the neighborhood in cases where the developers were willing to provide landscaping and increased open space in exchange.

Another resident of the neighborhood informed the Commission that he had talked with 38 of his neighbors, all of whom had expressed their support of the applicants' proposal.

Joan Siewald, of 59 Burnside Street, stated that while she had opposed other developments proposed for the Glen Park area, she had given her wholehearted support to the convalescent hospital project.

No one was present to speak in opposition to the subject applications.

Mr. Steele recommended approval of both of the subject applications. He stated that there is a need for convalescent hospital facilities in San Francisco since governmental agencies are still finding it necessary to place Medi-Cal patients outside of the city because of the unavailability of beds within the city; however, even if the proposed facility were not to be built, he felt that development of R-3 uses along Bosworth Street to Hamerton Avenue would be appropriate and timely given the change in character of Bosworth Street itself as well as the pending BART station. He indicated that he had prepared two draft resolutions, one approving the requested zone change and the second approving the proposed convalescent hospital, subject to four conditions; and he summarized those four conditions as follows:

1. The provision of not less than 42 automobile parking spaces and one off-street loading space suitable for regular service as well as for ambulance operation.

2. Not less than 35% of the patients should be subsidized patients under the Medi-Cal Program or successor programs for so long as governmental agencies find it necessary to place San Francisco residents outside the city because of insufficient facilities within the city.

3. Detailed architecture and landscaping plans which indicate the architectural treatment of the building, all signs, and, landscaping of the property whould be submitted to the Department of City Planning for review and approval before application is made for any building permit.

4. The conditional use authorization should expire two years after the date of authorization unless a building permit has been approved and construction has begun.

Mr. Hsieh stated that the conditions suggested by Mr. Steele met with his approval.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6312 be adopted and that Application ZM68.26 be approved.

Subsequently, it was moved by Commissioner Porter and seconded by Commissioner Newman that Application CU68.30 be approved subject to the conditions recommended by Mr. Steele.

Commissioner Fleishhacker, noting that the hospital would be exempt from the 40 foot height limit imposed on dwellings in R-3 districts because of its institutional nature, asked how the Commission could be assured that the building would not affect views from properties located south of the subject property. Mr. Steele replied that condition No. 1 of the draft resolution provided that the final

plans for construction should be in general conformity with the preliminary plans which had been filed with the application; and he remarked that the preliminary plans had indicated that the building would have a height of approximately 65 feet.

Mr. Hsieh stated that the building would not exceed the height of buildings located immediately to the south of the site; and, since the north walls of those buildings are blank, their views would not be affected.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if the entrance to the parking garage had been designed so that there would be a minimum of interference with traffic on Bosworth Street. Mr. Steele replied that parking would probably have to be prohibited in front of the hospital so that the curb land could be used for right turns into the garage. Mr. Hsieh stated that the garage would have a separate side exit.

Commissioner Porter asked if convalescent hospitals constructed in C-2 districts would be similarly unrestricted as to height. Mr. Steele replied in the negative, indicating that such buildings would be controlled by a floor-area ratio standard.

Commissioner Porter stated that she was somewhat astonished that the City Planning Code permits institutions to rise higher than residential buildings in R-3 districts.

After further discussion, the question was called and the Commission voted unanimously to adopt Resolution No. 6313 and to approve application CU68.30 subject to the conditions contained in the draft resol ion.

At 4:35 P.M. President Brinton announced a five minute recess. The Commission reconvened at 4:40 P.M. and proceeded with hearing of the remainder of the agenda. Commissioner Kearney absented himself from the remainder of the meeting.

CU68.36 340 to 398 Monterey Boulevard between 275 feet and 594 feet west of Congo Street.
Request for a 172-bed convalescent hospital in an R-3 District.

The Secretary adivsed the Commission that a letter had been received from George McKray, attorney for a group of homeowners on Joost Street, requesting that hearing of this matter be postponed so that the Joost Street property owners would have an opportunity to meet with the applicants to determine if the proposed facility would have any detrimental affect on the neighborhood. Mr. McKray also suggested that a contour map should be prepared by the architect to indicate the relationship between the proposed facility and the homes on Joost Street.

Mr. McKray, who was present in the audience, noted that the applicants in the previous case had discussed their plans with residents of the neighborhood and that they had made an attempt to resolve any problems which might have been of concern to property owners in the area. He hoped that the Commission would be

willing to postpone its hearing of the subject application so that individuals owning property in the vicinity of the Monterey Boulevard site could have a similar opportunity to meet with the applicants.

Amiel Damia, agent for the applicants, supported the request for postponement and asked that the matter be rescheduled for hearing in the Commission's meeting on January 9.

Mr. McCormich, a resident of the subject neighborhood, noted that many property owners from the area were present in the audience; and, since it might be difficult for some of those people to retunr on January 9, he urged that they be allowed to speak during the present meeting. He indicated that he was concerned about the 65-foot height of the proposed convalescent hospital which would be built in an area where residential buildings are not allowed to exceed a height of 40 feet; however, if the architects were willing to revise the plans to lower the space between the floors of the building, he felt that the project might be acceptable.

President Brinton felt that postponement of the hearing might be desirable so matters such as this could be discussed between the applicants and residents of the neighborhood.

Commissioner Porter noted that plans for the building were not yet complete; and, under the circumstances, she felt that it would be very difficult for either the Commission or members of the audience to gain a detailed understanding of the proposal. While she regretted that many residents of the neighborhood had come to the meeting without receiving an opportunity to be heard, she agreed that it would be best to postpone the Commission's hearing of this matter until January 9.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Porter, and carried unanimously that hearing of the subject application be postponed until January 9, 1969 at 3:00 P.M.

CU68.35 518 - 42nd Avenue and property on the southeast corner of 42nd Avenue and Geary Boulevard.
Request for a 110-bed convalescent hospital in an R-3 District.

Mr. Steele referred to land use and zoning maps to describe the subject property, noting that the site had previously been occupied by a nonconforming open land use (a plant nursery) which would have had to terminate in 1970 if it had not been abandoned voluntarily. He stated that the applicant proposed to construct a 110-bed convalescent hospital; and plans which had been submitted indicated that the building would be two stories high with a basement garage accessible from 42nd Avenue.

Burt Pearce, representing the owner of the subject property, described a rendering which had been prepared of the proposed project, pointing out that a five-foot setback would be provided along the street frontage boundaries of the property

for landscaping. He stated that he had worked closely with the staff of the Department of City Planning in preparing plans for the facility; and, on being advised by the staff that the 14 parking spaces proposed would not be sufficient, he had revised the plans to include 22 parking spaces. In conclusion, he stated that the rear portion of the property would be screened from the street and from abutting properties by landscaping.

Dragomir Zegura, 534 41st Avenue, pointed out that almost all of the subject neighborhood, with the exception of one grocery store and a firehouse, is developed residentially. The subject property had formerly been used for a plant nursery; and, although the City Planning Commission had authorized continuance of that use, they had indicated that no other subsequent commercial use of the site would be permitted. Mr. Zegura felt that convalescent hospitals are basically commercial in nature; and, for the people living in such institutions, it is the "end of the line." He advised the Commission that many older people live in the subject neighborhood; and he felt that it would not be desirable for them to have to observe the comings and goings at the proposed convalescent hospital. Mr. Zegura also felt that the 22 parking spaces proposed by the applicant would not be sufficient. He estimated that the hospital would have 50 or 60 employees; and he doubted that the parking spaces which would be available would be sufficient to serve their needs, let alone the parking needs which would be generated by relatives and friends who would be visiting the 110 patients who would be housed in the facility. Therefore, if the subject application were approved, he believed that it would cause parking problems in the subject neighborhood.

Mrs. Opdyke, 525 42nd Avenue, expressed her concern about the applicant's proposal to locate the service and ambulance driveway for the proposed facility on 42nd Avenue opposite her home.

Mr. Pearce stated that the driveway and service area would be screened. He also remarked that most of the employees working in the convalescent hospital would arrive by means of public transportation; and, therefore, he felt that the number of parking spaces proposed would be sufficient.

Miss McCollough, 543 41st Avenue, remarked that the subject neighborhood already has its fair share of noise caused by ambulances going to Fort Miley and by the fire engines which are housed directly across from the subject site. She also remarked that the merger of Geary Boulevard with Point Lobos Avenue is a dangerous intersection; and she felt that vehicles arriving at or departing from the proposed convalescent hospital would further effect traffic congestion in the area.

James Gill, 518 - 42nd Avenue, stated that he is presently living in the house which will be torn down to accommodate the proposed convalescent hospital. He felt that the subject property could be much better used for residential purposes than for the proposed convalescent hospital; and, as a result of his own experience, he was keenly aware that there is a need for additional dwelling units in the area. In conclusion, he remarked that most of the houses on 42nd Avenue between Geary and Anza Street do not have garages; and, under such circumstances, he felt that no use of the subject site should be approved by the Commission which would contribute to parking congestion in the area.

Mrs. Oruga indicated that parking congestion in the area is further complicated by the fact that fireman, reporting for duty at the firehouse across from the subject site, park their cars on the streets.

Stanley Reinfeld represented his mother who owns property located at 526 42nd Avenue. He felt that the proposed facility would undoubtedly add to parking and traffic congestion in the area. Although he appreciated the fact that the service entrance to the hospital would be screened, he felt that people living across the street would much rather look at a duplex than at the service yard of a convalescent hospital. Most importantly, it was his opinion that the present residential character of the neighborhood should be maintained and that no additional commercial uses should be introduced. In conclusion, he remarked that the applicants, unlike those who had proposed the convalescent hospital on Bosworth Street which was previously considered by the Commission, had neither contact people living in the neighborhood nor given a very lucid description of their project during the present hearing.

Mrs. Reinfeld stated that she had moved to the subject neighborhood because it is peaceful and quiet. She felt that it would not be desirable to have a convalescent hospital across the street from her property; and, therefore, she urged that the subject application be disapproved and that the property be used for residential purposes.

Mr. Gill questioned whether the subject property would be a good site for a convalescent hospital since its patients might be disturbed by the fire engines garaged across the street and by the numerous buses which pass along Geary Boulevard in front of the property.

Mr. Steele recommended that the subject application be approved with four conditions. He stated that there is a need for such facilities within the city of San Francisco since governmental agencies still find it necessary to place Medi-Cal patients outside of the city because of the unavailability of beds within the city; and he did not feel that the situation would be changed by the construction of the facilities which had already been authorized by the Commission. He submitted a draft resolution to the Commission for its consideration and summarized the four conditions which it contained.

Mr. Pearce stated that he had reviewed the conditions and had found them to be acceptable. He advised the Commission that the proposed facility would not generate ambulance traffic; and, while the City Planning Code requires only one parking space for every eight beds in general hospitals, one parking space would be provided for every four beds in the proposed facility. He remarked that convalescent patients preferred to be housed in active neighborhoods rather than in quiet locations; and, therefore, he felt that the subject site would be suitable for such a use.

Commissioner Porter asked how many apartment units could be constructed on the subject site. Mr. Steele replied that 19 drawing units could be constructed on the combined R-2 and R-3 portions of the site.

Danny Carrigan, prospective operator of the proposed facility, stated that he is presently associated with a similar facility which provides 14 parking spaces for 61 beds. However, the maximum number of parking spaces ever used at one time is four. Therefore, particularly in view of the adequacy of public transportation to the subject site, he felt that the number of parking spaces proposed for the facility would be sufficient. Furthermore, contrary to the opinion expressed by residents of the neighborhood, convalescent hospitals do not reflect an "end of the road" atmosphere. He stated that there is a desperate need for the type of facility which was being proposed; and he felt that it would be an asset to the neighborhood.

Mr. Gill stated that two of his relatives had resided in convalescent hospitals; and, therefore, he was familiar with such facilities. He agreed that the proposed facility would probably be an excellent investment for its promoter; however, looking to the best interests of the city and the subject neighborhood, he felt that it would be better to use the subject property for residential purposes.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Newman and seconded by Commissioner Porter that the subject application be disapproved.

Commissioner Fleishhacker indicated his support of this motion. He acknowledged that the type of facility proposed is needed in San Francisco; and he felt that residents of the subject neighborhood were not well informed as to the actual character of such facilities. However, he believed that the subject property would not be a suitable location for such a facility. Therefore, while he was prepared to vote for disapproval of the subject application, he did not intend to negate the need for properly located convalescent hospitals in San Francisco.

When the question was called, the Commission voted unanimously to adopt Resolution No. 6314 and to disapprove the subject application.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, December 12, 1968.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, December 12, 1968, at 2:15 P.M. in the meeting room at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: William M. Brinton, President; Mrs. Charles B. Porter, Vice President; Virgil L. Elliott, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Jr., James S. Kearney, Walter S. Newman and Walter Wight, members of the City Planning Commission.

ABSENT: None

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation; Phoebe H. Brown, Planner IV; Samuel Jung, Planner IV; Ralph Mead, Planner IV-(Zoning); Wayne Rieke, Planner IV-(Zoning); and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

Donald Canter represented the San Francisco Examiner; Scott Blakey, represented the San Francisco Chronicle.

CURRENT MATTERS

The Director reported on the first meeting of the Urban Design Citizen's Advisory Committee which was held yesterday.

The Director advised the Commission that he had appeared before the State Assembly Committee on Transportation and Commerce earlier in the day. R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, remarked that the Board of Supervisors had referred a proposed ordinance "amending the City Planning Code by amending Section 208.2 thereof to include as a conditional use in C-2 districts fully automatic passenger vehicle-washing services" to the City Planning Commission for review and recommendation. The staff had reviewed the proposed ordinance; however, since the Planning Code provisions relating to automotive uses are now contained in Section 223 of the City Planning Code, the amendment of Section 208.2 proposed by the Board of Supervisors would no longer be appropriate. Nevertheless, the staff was prepared to make recommendations for amendments to Section 223 of the City Planning Code and other sections as appropriate, the purpose of which would be to permit automobile washing as a conditional use in C-2, C-3-S, and CM zoning districts and as a principle use in M-1 and M-2 zoning districts. Therefore, he recommended that the City Planning Commission declare its intention of holding a public hearing to consider these proposed amendments and that it authorize the zoning administrator to set a time and place for the public hearing.

The Director recommended adoption of the draft resolution which had been prepared to cover the recommendations made by Mr. Steele.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Resolution No. 6315.

ZM68.32 3537 and 3543-45 Jennings Street, northeast corner of Meade Avenue. R-1 to an R-2 District (under advisement from meeting of December 5, 1968).

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, reported on this matter as follows:

Mrs. Holland's application for rezoning was taken under advisement for one week in order for us to make a further investigation and to report to the Planning Commission on three aspects of the case. Staff has investigated and found the following situation:

Mrs. Holland proposes to operate a "Residential Care Home for the Aged" formerly called a "Boarding Home for the Aged". She would be licensed under regulations of the State Department of Social Welfare which are administered by the City and County Department of Social Services. Mr. Lolax of the licensing division of the latter agency did not have time to investigate the home this week, but provided us with the basic requirements and staff went through the home. It would appear that the home can be made suitable for four or five patients with very little work.

The basic regulations are:

1. Patients 65 years of age and over are given food, lodging and some personal care such as helping with baths and reminding to take medication, but no nursing care is permitted and patients must be capable of taking care of most of their basic needs by themselves.

2. No more than two patients to a room. 140 square foot minimum area for two patients; 100 square feet for one in a room.

3. A second face bowl and water closet is required if more than four persons, including the operator, occupy the home.

The existing home has a living room, two bedrooms, a kitchen, a bath and a back porch which is used for sleeping. There is an illegal apartment in the basement which could not be legalized as an apartment even if rezoned because the kitchen would be below grade and have a low ceiling height, but the living room of the lower unit could serve as a bedroom for Mrs. Holland. Two patients could be placed in the living room and two in the larger bedroom and one in the smaller bedroom for a total of five patients. A second toilet facility could be installed in an area primarily used as a pantry. The back porch would be used as a day room for the patients and possibly as a bedroom for Mrs. Holland. The kitchen is quite large. If the one bedroom is not large enough to accommodate two patients, it might be enlarged by expansion into part of the kitchen.

The financial arrangements for homes such as this are based on an Old Age Security payment of $188.50 per month to each patient. The usual arrangement is for the patient to sign his monthly check over to the operator of the home who would return about $20.00 to the patient for spending money. Although Mrs. Holland says that she would charge only $80 or $90 a month, she could charge $168.50 if required to make the project feasible. She says that her expenses would be low because the home is paid for and is in good repair.

The Bay Area Health Facilities Planning Association does not review this type of facility because only custodial care rather than nursing care is given.

Mrs. Holland has canvassed the people on her block and they have signed a copy of the case report for this case indicating that they are not opposed to her proposal.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if nursing homes may ever be allowed as conditional uses in R-1 districts. Mr. Steele replied in the negative but indicated that unlicensed care of roomers may be permitted in R-1 districts as an accessory use.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if the use proposed by the present applicant could be approved as an accessory use in an R-1 district. Mr. Steele replied in the negative, noting that the applicant proposed to provide licensed nursing care for four or five patients.

Commissioner Fleishhacker stated that he had no objection to the proposed use; however, he felt that it was unfortunate that approval of the use would require rezoning of the property. President Brinton remarked that the property could be rezoned back to R-1 at a later date if the use proposed by the applicant were to be terminated.

The Director regarded the use proposed as desirable; and he felt that the property reclassification requested was of marginal importance. Therefore, he was prepared to recommend approval of the subject application.

Commissioner Newman asked the applicant if she believed that it would be economically feasible for her to provide care for only four patients. Mrs. Holland replied in the affirmative.

The Secretary read a letter from Mrs. Grace E. Ruther, owner of the At Your Service Agency, 31 Collingwood Street, testifying to Mrs. Holland's nursing abilities and good character.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Newman, and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6316 be adopted and that the subject application be approved.

R68.73 Howard Street at South Van Ness Avenue, change in official sidewalk width.

Samuel Jung, reported on the matter as follows:

"The purpose of the proposal is to facilitate turning movements by providing an additional full lane in-bound at the junction of South Van Ness Avenue and Howard Street, for a short distance just north of 13th Street. At this point in-bound traffic must make a left turn in order to continue on South Van Ness Avenue rather than Howard Street, and the sidewalk narrowing would provide one left-turn only lane, one optional lane for either left turn or northbound, and two lanes for northbound on Howard. The east sidewalk on Howard Street would be narrowed in a taper for a distance of 190 feet from 12 feet down to 8 feet at 13th Street. The west sidewalk would be narrowed in a taper from 12 feet to 7 feet, for a distance of 80 feet north of South Van Ness Avenue. There will also be modifications to the traffic islands at the intersection.

The outside lanes on Howard Street are parking lanes but will be towaway zones during the morning and evening peak periods.

There is not a large number of pedestrians in the area. The Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation has approved the proposal."

The Director recommended approval of the proposed project.

After discussion it was moved by Commissioner Porter, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the proposed change in sidewalk width on Howard Street at South Van Ness Avenue, as shown on drawing STR-4401, is in conformity with the Master Plan.

REPORT ON THE PRESENT STATUS OF THE FERRY BOAT FEASIBILITY STUDY

Orris W. Willard, member of the San Francisco-Marin Water Transportation Study Committee, reported on steps which had been taken during the past three and one half years to obtain funds for the water transportation study, to establish the study committee, and to select Arthur D. Little, Inc. as consultants for the study. He described the type of study which the consultants proposed to undertake and estimated that the study would be completed by May 15, 1969. During the course of the study, he felt that the Planning Departments in both San Francisco and Marin County should be kept well informed on all aspects of the work done by the consultants and by the Committee; and he hoped that the members of the San Francisco City Planning Commission and their Director of Planning would accept his invitation to attend some of the meetings of the Water Transportation Study Committee.

Commissioner Porter felt that it was particularly important that the Director of Planning should maintain constant liaison with the Water Transportation Study Committee so that major disagreements with the final recommendations of the study committee could be avoided. The Director stated that he would be quite willing to monitor the study and to make any suggestions which he might deem appropriate.

President Brinton thanked Mr. Willard for coming to the meeting to present his report.

President Brinton informed the Commission that his law firm has a suit pending against the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency; and, for that reason he wished to disqualify himself for participating in the consideration of the next two items on the Commission's agenda. He therefore absented himself from the meeting room for the remainder of the meeting; and Vice President Porter assumed the chair.

R68.78 Proposed Redevelopment Plan for Hunters Point.

Walter Gaby, Chief of the Planning Division of the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, reported on the history and background of both the Hunters Point and the Butchertown Redevelopment projects.

Jerry Belcher, Planner for the Hunters Point Project, described the proposed redevelopment plan for the Hunters Point project area, summarizing the maps and text, dated November 22, 1968, which had previously been mailed to members of the Commission for review.

Vice President Porter asked what the overall density of the project would be. Mr. Belcher replied that the project would have an average density of 30 units per acre.

Commissioner Newman asked if the three schools indicated on the plan would all be at the elementary level. Mr. Belcher replied in the affirmative.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked about the grade of the streets proposed for the project area. Mr. Belcher indicated that the streets would generally not exceed a grade of 15%. He indicated, however, that all of the streets had been reviewed with the Traffic Engineering Bureau of the Department of Public Works.

Commissioner Kearney, noting that the plan contained provisions for the possible construction of a few high-rise buildings within the project area, inquired about the probable height of those buildings. He also asked for the Redevelopment Agency's evaluation of the advantages and disadvantages of such buildings.

Mr. Belcher replied that buildings approximately 20 stories in height had been considered. If such buildings were to be constructed, they would benefit the economics of the project by providing market rate units of the type similar to those which had been constructed in the Golden Gateway project area. He did not believe that the buildings would bring any serious disadvantages; however, he indicated that the Redevelopment Agency was not yet sure that developers could be found who would be willing to construct such buildings within the Hunters Point Redevelopment project area.

William Kellar, project manager for Hunters Point, advised the Commission that the three-acre site reserved for high-rise buildings would not be developed until the last phase of the project because the site is presently occupied by temporary war housing. However, after completion of the remainder of the project, he felt that the area might have greater attractiveness for high-rise developers. Mr. Kellar also advised the Commission that of the 700 families presently residing within the project area, only 24 families could not be housed within the new dwelling units which were presently being proposed, either because their incomes are too low or because they require units with five or six bedrooms. He indicated, however, that detailed studies are being made of the problems posed by those families; and he felt confident that proper and satisfactory arrangements could eventually be made for their relocation.

Commissioner Kearney remarked that there have been indications that the Federal government intends to initiate programs encouraging construction of dwellings which could be privately owned by lower income families; and he wondered if consideration had been given to the achievement of such a goal within the Hunters Point project area. Mr. Kellar applied in the affirmative, indicating that every effort would be made to provide some condominium units within the project area.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked how relocation of the families presently living within the project area would be accomplished. Mr. Kellar replied that the redevelopment project would be phased so that none of the present occupants would be moved unless they could be accommodated in new buildings which will be constructed within the project area.

Commissioner Kearney noted that some of the housing units which have been constructed for low income families have been attractive while others have been ugly. He asked what assurance could be given that the housing proposed by the Redevelopment Agency would be attractive. Mr. Kellar stated that the low income housing proposed would not be constructed cheaply; rather, the housing would be constructed with subsidies, such as those offered under the Federal government's 221B3 program, so that high rental fees would not have to be charged.

The Director stated that he had found the final plan to be in general conformity with the preliminary plan for the project area which had previously been approved by the City Planning Commission. Therefore he had prepared a draft resolution approving the Redevelopment Plan for the Hunters Point project area; and he recommended its adoption.

Edith Witt, representing the Human Rights Commission, stated that her commission had not yet received any information regarding the plan; consequently, she was prepared to speak neither in support of or in opposition to the plan.

Mr. Kellar stated that copies of the plan would be made available to all interested parties prior to the public hearing which has been scheduled before the Board of Supervisors on January 13.

Vice President Porter noted that the plan being considered by the Commission was general rather than specific in nature; and she assumed that the Human Rights Commission would be more concerned about the more detailed decisions which would be made at a later date regarding the actual number of units constructed for low, middle and high income families.

Mrs. Westbrook, Chairman of the Joint Housing Committee, stated that she and other residents of the subject neighborhood had worked long and hard to improve living conditions in the area. She believed that the plan which had

been prepared by the Redevelopment Agency would result in reconstruction of an integrated community of which all San Franciscans could be proud; and she hoped that the plan would be approved by the City Planning Commission.

After further discussion it was moved by Commissioner Newman and seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker that the plan be approved.

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that a great deal of data was contained in the written report which had been provided by the Redevelopment Agency; and he indicated that he had not had sufficient time to become thoroughly familiar with all the information it contained. Therefore, while he was prepared to give general approval to the plan, he wondered if he would then become committed to the Redevelopment Agency's proposals on a lot by lot, house by house basis.

Mr. Belcher stated that any construction proposed for the project area would have to conform to the zoning of the property. Therefore, if buildings were to be proposed which would not be allowable under present zoning, reclassification or planned unit development applications would have to be considered by the Commission in the future.

Commissioner Porter asked if financing had already been obtained to back up the proposed plan. Mr. Gaby replied that applications were on file in Washington before changes in Federal financing programs were announced.

After further discussion, the question was called and the Commission voted unanimously to adopt Resolution No. 6317 and to approve the Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan.

At 4:25 P.M. Vice President Porter announced a five-minute recess. The Commission reconvened at 4:30 P.M. and proceeded with hearing of the remainder of the calendar.

R68.79 Proposed Redevelopment Plan for Butchertown.

Donald Black, Planner for the Redevelopment Agency, described the proposed Redevelopment Plan for the Butchertown project area, summarizing the maps and text dated December 10, 1968, which had previously been mailed to members of the Commission for review.

Commissioner Newman asked if the proposed Hunters Point Freeway would be constructed at grade through the Butchertown project area. Mr. Black replied that the State had originally proposed to construct the freeway at grade; however, acting on the request of the Redevelopment Agency, the State had revised its plans to call for the freeway to be built on an elevated structure over Arthur Avenue so that that thoroughfare could be used at grade

for access to the Port's new container facility and to the new industrial complexes to be constructed in Butchertown.

Commissioner Kearney, noting that Butchertown had been afflicted with odor problems in the past, asked if plans were being made by the Redevelopment Agency for solving this problem. Mr. Black replied that the text of the plan for the project area indicated that stockyards, slaughter houses, abattoirs, and meat-rendering activities could be constructed in the project area only if they were to be authorized as conditional uses by the City Planning Commission. Furthermore, the plan, using the language of the City Planning Code, would prohibit any use which by reason of its nature or manner of operation would create conditions hazardous, noxious or offensive to the community through the excesive emission of odors, fumes, smoke, cinders, dust, gas, noise, vibrations, refuse or water-controlled waste.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked why immediate action could not be taken to correct odor emission from industries presently located in Butchertown. Mr. Black replied that most of the present industries in the area existed before standards for the control of odor were formulated; and new requirements could not be made retroactive. Nevertheless, many of those industries would have to be relocated, and it was the understanding of the Redevelopment Agency that the owners of those firms would be willing to install new and up-to-date equipment for the control of odor and air pollution.

Commissioner Kearney suggested that it might be desirable for the staff of the Department of City Planning to undertake its own investigation of light industrial odor problems and to make suggestions for alleviation of the problem.

Vice President Porter asked about height limits within the subject project area. Mr. Black replied that developments near the Hunters Point Ridge will be limited to 40 feet in height, whereas developments located nearer the water would be allowed to reach a height of 65 feet.

Commissioner Newman remarked that ground breaking for the Butchertown project would represent the culmination of many years of cooperation between many civic groups; and he felt that the project itself would represent a tremendous step forward towards making available certain types of jobs for the City. He asked when the first property within the area would be acquired by the Redevelopment Agency. Mr. Gaby replied that the project could be initiated on February 1, 1969, if funds are made available by the Federal government by that time; however, he anticipated that it would be summer time before funds are actually made available for the project.

The Director recommended approval of the Butchertown Redevelopment Plan.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Elliott, seconded by Commissioner Newman,and carried unanimously that Resolution No. 6318 be adopted and that the Butchertown Redevelopment Plan be approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Secretary

SAN FRANCISCO

CITY PLANNING COMMISSION

Minutes of the regular meeting held Thursday, December 19, 1968.

The City Planning Commission met pursuant to notice on Thursday, December 19, 1968, at 1:00 P.M. at 100 Larkin Street.

PRESENT: Mrs. Charles B. Porter, Vice President; Virgil L. Elliott, Mortimer Fleishhacker, Jr., and James S. Kearney, members of the Planning Commission.

ABSENT: William M. Brinton, President; James K. Carr, and Walter S. Newman.

The staff of the Department of City Planning was represented by Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning; R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementations; Dean R. Macris, Assistant Director-Plans and Programs; Marie Carlberg, Planner III; Sidney Shaw, Planner III; James Paul, Planner III; and Lynn E. Pio, Secretary.

1:00 P.M. - Field Trip

Members of the Commission and staff departed from 100 Larkin Street at 1:00 P.M. to take a field trip to properties scheduled for consideration during the Commission's Zoning Hearing on January 9, 1969.

2:15 P.M. - Room 282, City Hall

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Commissioner Kearney, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the minutes of the meetings of October 17 and 31, 1968, be approved as submitted.

CURRENT MATTERS

The Director distributed copies of a draft resolution which he had prepared for adoption by the City Planning Commission to authorize him to execute an agreement with Marshall, Kaplan, Ganz and Khan to undertake social and economic studies related to the development of an urban design plan. After reading the draft resolution, he recommended its adoption.

Vice President Porter asked about the approximate cost of the proposed contract. Dean R. Macris, Assistant Director-Plans and Programs, replied that the amount of a contract would be approximately $30,000.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked what particular qualifications the firm of Marshall, Kaplan, Ganz and Khan would bring to the urban design project. The

Director replied that the organization in question had been more involved with social surveys than any other firm in the country; and he cited some of the projects with which the firm had been involved. In response to a question raised by Commissioner Kearney regarding scope of the consultant study, the Director stated that Marshall, Kaplan, Ganz and Khan are not urban designers and will not be involved in the formulation of an urban design plan; rather, the firm would prepare a separate report on social planning which had been requested by the Federal and State governments. Inevitably, however, the perception studies undertaken by the consultant firm would have to be built into the urban design plan which is being prepared by the staff.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Kearney, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Resolution No. 6319.

R. Spencer Steele, Assistant Director-Implementation, distributed copies of a draft resolution which he had prepared to announce the Commission's intention of holding a public hearing to consider proposed amendments to Section 225 of the City Planning Code, and other sections as appropriate, the purpose of which would be to permit junk yards as conditional uses in M-1 and M-2 districts. Adoption of the draft resolution would also authorize the Zoning Administrator to set a date for this public hearing.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Elliott, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6320.

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that he had noted that conditional use parking lots which had been landscaped in conformance with conditions established by the Commission have a much better appearance than others which have not fulfilled the landscaping requirements; and he wondered if action could be taken by the staff to enforce general compliance with the landscape requirements established by the Commission. He also asked if it would be possible to establish landscaping requirements for parking lots which were authorized before the Commission began the practice of setting landscaping requirements. The Director stated that he would review these questions and report back to the Commission at a later date.

REFERRAL

R68.70 REVOCABLE PERMIT FOR BRIDGE OVER JESSIE STREET BETWEEN FIRST AND ECKER STREETS

Marie Carlberg, Planner III, reported on this matter as follows:

> "The proposed is for a bridge over Jessie Street connecting two buildings leased by Wells Fargo Bank, 50 and 62 First Street for its data-processing center. Jessie Street is an

alley, 27.5 feet wide, running parallel to Market Street. The proposed bridge would be located 102.5 feet southwest of First Street and would be 27.5 feet long and 10.5 feet wide, at an elevation of 46 to 60 feet above the ground, connecting the fourth floor of 62 First Street with the fifth floor of 50 First Street. There is a similar bridge across Jessie Street southwest of Ecker Street, and enters across a number of other alleys south of Market Street."

In conclusion, Miss Carlberg stated that revocable permit applications are usually handled administratively by the staff of the Department of City Planning; however, because of the impact which a pedestrian bridge might have, the matter had been brought before the Commission for review.

Don Bently, serving as engineer for the Wells Fargo Bank on the subject project, indicated that he was present to answer any questions which might be raised by members of the Commission.

No one was present to speak in opposition to the application.

The Director recommended that the proposed revocable encroachment permit be approved as in conformity with the Master Plan.

Commissioner Fleishhacker remarked that the proposed bridge, unlike others which have been constructed in the immediate vicinity, might actually improve the appearance of Jessie Street. The Director stated that the staff of the Department of City Planning had worked with the applicants toward that end.

After further discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Fleishhacker, seconded by Commissioner Kearney, and carried unanimously that the Director be authorized to report that the proposed revocable encroachment permit for a bridge across Jessie Street between Lot 5, Block 3708 and Lot 6, Block 3708 is in conformity with the Master Plan.

It was further suggested that the applicant consider elimination of the horizontal muntins in the windows of the bridge, retaining only the vertical muntins, to give the bridge a clear, more straight-forward design.

The Director introduced Dennis Ryan, Beatrice Ryan, David Smith, John Roberto, and Mike Cronbach, recent appointees to the staff of the Department of City Planning.

PRESENTATION OF CHINATOWN RECONNAISSANCE STUDY REPORT

Dean R. Macris, Assistant Director-Plans and Programs summarized the report on the Chinatown Reconnaissance Study which had been undertaken by the staff of the Department of City Planning. He stated that the purpose of the study was to

determine the nature and cost of preparing a comprehensive plan for Chinatown and to indicate how such a plan might be carried out. The study was devised in recognition of the need for establishing policies, programs, and priorities for that important district of the city.

In preparing the report, the staff had tried to be as comprehensive as possible, including matters of social as well as physical significance to the community. Social questions, however, had been posed within the contexts of physical planning systems--residence, recreation, education, public safety and health, commerce, industry, transportation, and urban design. The report itself had been divided into four sections. The first section presented a series of policy issues by planning systems to illustrate both the variety and range of issues a Chinatown comprehensive plan might consider. These issues represented the kinds of policy decisions which would have to be made in the course of carrying out the planning study. Section II of the report contained a proposed outline for a comprehensive plan for Chinatown, indicating in general terms what would be the context and structure of the plan. The third section of the report presented a generalized description of a work program for the Chinatown study, discussing the kinds of information to be sought, the surveys to be carried out, and a general order or phasing for completion of major work items. Section IV of the report consisted of an appendix of statistical data for information.

Mr. Macris emphasized that the report did not recommend area boundaries for a Chinatown plan. For the purposes of the reconnaissance study, it was felt that an indication of a core area and adjacent areas with large Chinese populations would suffice; and the comprehensive planning study itself, if undertaken, would be concerned with the identification of community boundaries after more extensive evaluation.

In conclusion, Mr. Macris stated that the report contained two alternative recommendations for the carrying out of the proposed comprehensive Chinatown planning study. Under the first alternative, the study would be undertaken as soon as funds could be made available, utilizing both department staff and special consultant services. However, if the planning study could not be undertaken at the present time, Alternative Number Two would provide for the employment of a senior level staff person to work with the community in identifying issues, solving immediate problems, and continuing an analysis of the long term needs and potentials of the community.

Allan B. Jacobs, Director of Planning, commented on the Chinatown Reconnaissance Study as follows:

> "The "Chinatown Reconnaissance Study" report was widely distributed and reviewed with a number of community groups, organizations, and individuals. A series of meetings were held in the community to explain the purpose and objectives of the study, to discuss relevant issues, and to consider various courses of action for

the future involvement of the Planning Department in Chinatown. These meetings and discussions served to provide the staff of the Department with an understanding of community feeling concerning the possibility of preparing a comprehensive plan for Chinatown. The recommendations which follow are based upon the staff's consideration of the issues and the suggestions and reactions of the community.

1. It is recommended that the Department of City Planning undertake a two-year comprehensive planning study of the community as generally outlined in the "Chinatown Reconnaissance Study" report. This study, as proposed, would be carried out by a consultant team with the background needed to deal with the complex social and physical concerns of the community. In addition, the Department will assign a staff member at the Planner III level to work with the community and government agencies in solving more immediate kinds of issues and problems occurring during the course of the study. In effect, this staff person would act as a liaison man with the community, the Department, and other government agencies, and would coordinate the planning activities of the consultants.

The estimated cost of the two-year project is $250,000. This sum is somewhat larger than the estimate contained in the "Chinatown Reconnaissance Study" report. The difference is due to the fact that the original estimate noted in the report was based upon substantial utilization of the Department's planning staff, while the present estimate is based upon the costs of using predominantly consultant services to carry out the project. Moreover, since the preparation of the reconnaissance report, an additional evaluation was made of cost requirements for survey and planning work in Chinatown, and it was determined that costs be adjusted to reflect some rather special considerations in this area. Consequently, consultant services are recommended as the best approach because of the special kinds of skills that will be required, such as Chinese language-speaking ability and knowledge of survey techniques, and because of the number of other work projects the Department is committed to and must manage in the coming 18 months with its existing staff.

AMENDED
12/19/68

2. It is further recommended that a broadly-based citizens advisory committee be established of up to 30 people who live and work in the community. This committee would advise the Planning Commission, staff, and planning consultants throughout the entire planning process. The objective of this recommendation is to make citizen participation an integral part of the planning process and to involve a variety of points of view in the determination of development goals, objectives, policies and priorities. For this reason, the committee should be as widely based as possible including property owners, residents, businessmen, professionals, the youth, the elderly, and others."

Commissioner Kearney remarked that possibly no more than eight or ten persons appointed to a citizens advisory committee would actually be in attendance at any ordinary meeting of the committee; and, for that reason, he felt that it might be better to have at least forty members on the committee. Furthermore, if membership on the committee were limited to thirty people, certain people who are vitally interested in Chinatown might be excluded.

The Director stated that he was prepared to be flexible with regard to the number of people who would be appointed to the citizens advisory committee; and, to some extent, he felt that the committee itself should have some role in determining the scope of its membership. In any case, he felt that it might be desirable to require members of the committee to attend in person instead of sending alternates.

Commissioner Fleishhacker, noting that the Director had suggested that the citizens advisory committee should be established with up to 30 members who live <u>and</u> work in the community, asked if it might not be better to allow people who live <u>or</u> work in the community to become members of the committee. The Director agreed that a membership of people living or working in the community would be more representative.

Commissioner Fleishhacker stated that he hoped that the citizens advisory committee could be sufficiently representative to enable it to play a major role in the study; however, he hoped that membership on the committee would not be so loose that some people with vague affiliations to Chinatown would be allowed to have an important voice in the study.

Mr. Macris stated that no one had yet satisfactorily solved the dilemma of integrating citizen participation into the planning process; however, through the establishment of a broadly based citizens advisory committee, a vehicle would be provided whereby the collective judgement of the community could influence the study. In addition, through the extensive surveys proposed, the staff would have an opportunity to become familiar with the attitudes of people who would ordinarily be reluctant to come to meetings or to express their opinions in other ways.

Vice President Porter felt that it was extremely important that the final plan be acceptable to diverse elements of the community; otherwise, she feared that the plan might be worthless.

Allan Wong, Chairman of the Chinatown-North Beach District Council, urged the Commission to act favorably on the Director's recommendation that the two-year comprehensive planning study of Chinatown be undertaken as soon as possible. He remarked that Chinatown's social, economic and planning problems had deteriorated to a point of crisis; and, in view of those circumstances, he believed that the $250,000 needed for the study should be viewed as a very small expenditure on the part of the city. Furthermore, while the comprehensive study would be focused on long-range problems, he felt it equally important that a member of the staff of the Department of City Planning should be assigned to work with the community in an effort to solve more immediate kinds of issues and problems. Mr. Wong also stated that he would be quite interested in the ultimate membership of the citizens advisory committee which had been recommended by the Director.

Jackson Hue, representing the Chinese Chamber of Commerce, stated that the members of his organization had endorsed the proposed two-year planning study of Chinatown at their last meeting. He felt that establishment of a citizens advisory committee would be desirable; however, since people are often negligent about attending such meetings, he felt that the surveys which would be undertaken by consultants would serve as an even better means of becoming familiar with the attitudes of the community. In conclusion, he urged the Commission to modify the Director's recommendation by specifying that the comprehensive planning study should be carried out by staff and or consultants and that at least one-half of the people hired for the studies should be qualified Chinese-Americans whose background would enable them to represent the community.

The Director stated that he had no authority to hire specific people for his staff since such matters are handled by the Civil Service Commission; and, therefore, he would not promise that one-half of the staff members assigned to the Chinatown would be Chinese-American since he could not guarantee deliverance on his promise. With regard to consultants for the study, he agreed that effort should be made to involve as many qualified Chinese-Americans as possible; and he indicated that he would be willing to work towards that end as consultants are choosen to work on various phases of the project.

Mr. Hue felt that it was mandatory that individuals conducting surveys in Chinatown during the course of the study should be Chinese-Americans. The Director agreed.

Vice President Porter, noting that she had previously worked with a group of Chinese architects whose recommendations regarding height limitations in Chinatown had later been repudiated by members of the community, asked if the Commission could depend upon agreement of the Chinese community as to which consultants might be qualified and which not. Mr. Hue replied that everyone had agreed that the

architects who had worked with the Commission were well qualified in their particular field; however, those individuals had not been qualified in areas such as economics or other fields which were affected by their recommendations.

Vice President Porter remarked that the Director would bear full responsibility for producing the best possible report on Chinatown; and she doubted that anyone seriously questioned his desire to work with as many qualified Chinese consultants as possible. Under the circumstances, she felt that he should be allowed to exercise his discretion in the hiring of experts in the proposed study.

Mr. Hue agreed; however, he urged that his request be kept in mind.

Larry Jack Wong, a member of the staff of the Economic Opportunity Council informed the Commission that there is a great deal more cohesiveness and agreement within the Chinese community now than at any other time in the past. He stated that he had full confidence in the Director of Planning; however, even that confidence did not satisfy all of the concerns which he had regarding full participation of the community in the proposed study. Therefore, he supported Mr. Hue's suggestion that at least one-half the people employed for the study be Chinese-Americans.

With regard to the citizens advisory committee, Mr. Wong felt that it should be composed of more than just a group of "figureheads." He believed that the committee should be deeply involved in the study, almost, but not quite, to the point of having veto power. Only with such involvement could problems encountered in the past, such as those mentioned by Mrs. Porter, be avoided.

Vice President Porter remarked that it would be extremely important to reach a consensus between the Director of Planning and members of the community on basic procedures before going to the Board of Supervisors to request funds for the study.

Mr. Wong felt that the present cohesiveness of the Chinese community and the cooperation of the Director of Planning were both such that he envisioned no problem in obtaining funds from the Board of Supervisors. Concluding his comments on the proposed citizens advisory committee, he indicated to the Commission that he was much more concerned about the selection of members for the committee than about the total number of people to be chosen; and he hoped that the staff would work closely with the community in selecting people to serve on the committee. He also shared Commissioner Kearney's concern about attendance at meetings of the citizens advisory committee; and he hoped that the Commission would call on responsible representatives of the community to provide assurance that all members of the committee would actively participate in the project.

J. K. Chow remarked that he had persistently urged that a comprehensive plan be prepared not only for Chinatown but for the whole city; and, therefore, he congratulated the staff of the Department of City Planning for the reconnaissance study of Chinatown which had led to the recommendation for a two-year comprehensive

study of the area. He believed that $250,000 would be sufficient for the study; and he felt that the Board of Supervisors would consider the proposal sympathically if the City Planning Commission would endorse the Director's proposal. Mr. Chow acknowledged that it is not easy to provide a formula for obtaining a consensus of opinion; however, if the meetings of the citizens advisory committee were to be open to the public, and if sufficient notice were to be given of the meetings of that committee, he felt that the committee could be an effective instrument for expressing public opinion. Mr. Chow agreed that people must have faith in the judgment of experts. However, he also appreciated the value of common sense; and he felt that the opinions of the citizens of Chinatown should be considered during the course of the proposed study.

Alice Barkley of the Community Design Center cautioned against establishing a citizens advisory committee which would be "too large to handle." She stated that older people in Chinatown do not trust anyone, and as for the young, they did not care who was appointed to be on the committee since they would be there to see that things get done right in any case. Objectively, she felt that it should be recognized that Chinese planners are few and far between; therefore, while she agreed that it would be desirable to hire as many Chinese-Americans for the study as possible, she recognized the limitations in achieving such a goal. All in all, she felt that the young people were most concerned about the first phase of the proposed study, and they hoped that people assigned to work on the advisory committee would be really concerned and willing to work and that they be representative of the poor as well as the rich. She felt that the committee should reflect the opinion of the majority of people living in Chinatown, although they may be poor; and she felt that the committee should operate on a person-to-person basis instead of on an agency-to-client basis.

Quailand Tom, representing the Tom Family Association, whole-heartedly endorsed the recommendations of the Director of Planning. He also asked the Commission, during the course of the study, to focus particular attention on Chinatown's off-street parking problems.

Liz Abbott, Director of Clay Street Center, stated that she had participated in a study of Chinese family life three years ago. At that time, two committees had been established to aid in the study. The first was a citizens advisory committee which was somewhat representative of the community; and the second, with a smaller membership, was established as a professional advisory group--in that case composed of professionals who were working with social agencies. She felt that the City Planning Commission, also, might wish to consider the establishment of a professional advisory group to aid in the planning study which was being proposed.

Gordon Lau felt that it should be recognized that the study proposed would deal not just with buildings but with human beings and human problems. Furthermore, since Chinatown has less communication with other parts of the community than other areas of the city, he felt that the most essential thing to be accomplished by the Commission would be the establishment of communication with the Chinese people so that results of the study would be directed toward the best interests of Chinatown.

In order to achieve this communication, he felt that the citizens advisory committee should be composed of the old, the young, the rich, and the poor--especially the poor since they are so much more inarticulate than the others.

Mason Wong, representing the Inter-collegiate Committee for Social Action, stated that his organization was most concerned about the composition of the proposed citizens advisory committee. They felt that the Chinese elders had "sold youth down the river"; and they no longer had faith in their elders. He stated that it might lead only to another study. In that case, he felt that the money should be given directly to groups such as his to help people appointed to the citizens advisory committee would be genuinely concerned and that they would be more interested in helping others than in helping themselves; and he felt that it would be desirable to have bilingual Chinese on the committee.

Churchill Chew suggested that the citizens advisory committee should represent all segments of Chinatown from the right to the left and from the young to the old, etc. He noted that the Chinatown-North Beach District has a large population of people older than 65 years; and he believed that this phenomenon had arisen because the younger Chinese people had moved to more affluent neighborhoods since World War II, leaving the elderly behind. In any case, he felt that special attention should be given to the needs of the elderly during the course of the proposed study.

Terry Lee felt that "street kids" from Chinatown should be considered as an important factor in the proposed study. He stated that Chinatown is experiencing problems because of the alienation between young people and their parents; and he remarked that kids are rarely given any representation in Chinatown. During the course of the proposed study, however, he felt that they should not be forgotten.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked Mr. Lee if he considered himself a representative of the youth in Chinatown. Mr. Lee replied in the negative but indicated that he was concerned in their problems. He stated that problems are affecting both teenagers and pre-teens; and he pointed out that there are no facilities in Chinatown to handle such problems.

Commissioner Fleishhacker asked if the youth of Chinatown have organized into groups. Mr. Chow advised the Commission that there are presently three major youth groups in Chinatown.

Mr. Lee suggested that these groups, also, should be included in the citizens advisory committee. Commissioner Kearney asked if Mr. Lee could make any suggestions as to what might be done to improve the situation. Mr. Lee replied that he did not consider himself a representative of the street kids; and, therefore, he was not prepared to answer that question for them.

Vice President Porter suggested that the surveys which would be taken during the course of the proposed study might shed light on these problems.

After further discussion, the Director submitted a draft resolution which had been prepared to request a supplemental appropriation in the amount of $250,000 for the proposed two-year comprehensive planning study of Chinatown. Subsequently, he recommended adoption of the draft resolution.

After discussion, it was moved by Commissioner Kearney, seconded by Commissioner Fleishhacker, and carried unanimously that the draft resolution be adopted as City Planning Commission Resolution No. 6321.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:10 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn E. Pio
Administrative Secretary